LIBERTY—THE CONSTITUTION—UNION.

Banner of the Constitution.

DEVOTED TO GENERAL POLITICS, POLITICAL ECONOMY, STATE PAPERS, FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC NEWS, &c.

THE POWERS NOT DELEGATED TO THE U. STATES BY THE CONSTITUTION, NOR PROHIBITED BY IT TO THE STATES, ARE RESERVED TO THE STATES RESPECTIVELY OR TO THE PEOPLE.—*Amendments to the Constitution, Art. X*

VOL. II. NEW-YORK: WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1831. NO. 10.

CONGRESS.

REPORT ON MANUFACTURES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 13, 1831.

Mr. MALLARY, from the Committee on Manufactures, to which was referred so much of the President's Message as relates to the Tariff of Duties on Imports, and so much thereof as respects Manufactures, made the following report:

The Committee on Manufactures, to whom was referred so much of the President's Message "as relates to the Tariff of Duties on Imports, and so much thereof as respects Manufactures," report that they have taken this delicate subject into full consideration. This was due, alike to the source from whence a review was recommended, and to the importance of the subject itself. They feel confident that they have done it without mingling with the operation of their reasoning powers, unreasonable "likes and dislikes," either to the system of protecting domestic industry, or to the views expressed by the Chief Magistrate.

It is not the intention of the Committee to present to the House a mass of statistics, or labored arguments, in favor of the protecting system. In the recent discussions of the Tariff, all that could illustrate theory, or be proved by experience in our own and other countries, has been presented. Our Government has adopted, and endeavored to sustain, by repeated legislative enactments, a policy which has had the sanction of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. It has been sanctioned by "the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people." Confidence in its permanent duration is warmly inspired. It is this alone which can give it vigorous and successful action. A system of protection may appear perfect in our statute books, and yet be useless to the country if exposed to perpetual danger. Skill already matured, will not venture upon uncertainty. The power of invention will never be exerted, if it has no confidence in the promise, and repeated promise, of support. Capital will never come to the aid of skill and enterprize, if it has no security for investment. It must have confidence, it must find solid honesty in individuals, as well as firmness in government, or it will not be employed.

During the last session of Congress, the declaration was often repeated, that the system of protection should and would be maintained. It was presumed to have come from the people, and dictated by them to their Representatives. This was expressed by the most decisive majorities in Congress, on repeated occasions.

Its effects, so far as they have been developed, have answered the hopes of its most ardent friends. Capital flows widely and freely through our extended country. The genius of our people has been stimulated to greater and more diversified exertion. The useful arts are improving in every form that stern necessity or elegant taste may desire.

The Committee most cheerfully concur with the President in the animated view which he has taken of the condition of our country. They adopt his language in describing that condition: "With a population unparalleled in its increase, and possessing a character which combines the hardihood of enterprize with the considerateness of wisdom, we see in every section of our happy country a steady improvement in the means of social intercourse, and correspondent effects upon the genius and laws of our extended Republic." This is the language of truth and justice. It forms a subject of high and deep congratulation to every patriot mind. While other nations are suffering under oppressive burdens, or convulsed with bloody revolutions, we witness among ourselves, in general, a calm and confident repose. We see over all portions of our broad country, prosperity and happiness most equally and evenly diffused.

Such is the prospect before us. It is the offspring of our fortunate Government, and the wise policy which has been adopted, of cultivating our own resources, by the skill, and industry, and enterprize, of our own people. In considering that imperfection must be stamped on the highest and best of human institutions, it is matter of surprise, that "the apparent exceptions to the harmony of the prospect" are so few. They seem to arise rather from the exercise of fervid imagination, than from evils which really exist. It cannot, however, be expected that any code of laws, or any form of government, can dispense *precisely* the same benefits to every individual under their influence, wherever he may reside, or whatever may be his genius or pursuits. Nature herself has failed to do this. But when we see a great nation moving on with stately steps, unimpeded, to the height of happiness, opulence, and grandeur—when every portion, however minute, partakes amply of general prosperity, it would seem that the "apparent exceptions to the harmony of the prospect" might be permitted to melt down in warm felicitations, that the "prospect" of our whole country is so nobly gratifying. It is to this wide and comprehensive prospect that we may safely look for the substantial reasons to preserve that Union, which it is "most devoutly hoped may prove imperishable."

The Committee are much gratified to have the opinion of the President, clearly and fully expressed, that the tariff for protecting domestic industry is constitutional. They think it proper to quote language so clear and unequivocal. He says that "the power, to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust those duties with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry, is so completely incidental to that power, that it is difficult to suppose the existence of one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imposts to the General Government, without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them; and, consequently, if it be not possessed by the General Government, it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry, and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely cannot be the case: this indispensable power, thus surrendered by the States, must be within the scope of the authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress." The Committee would recommend this argument to the candid consideration of the House. Most especially would they invite to its calm consideration those of our fellow-citizens who honestly believe that a protecting tariff violates the Constitution. If there are any who have become regardless of the rights, interests, and welfare of the great majority of the nation; who are determined that all shall yield to their opinions; who insist that they are infallibly right, and every one else is absolutely wrong; on such, reason and argument can have no influence. Still, the cause which enables our Chief Magistrate to give us such a glowing view of the prosperity of our country as he has done, must and will continue. The States, in their sovereign capacity, as expressed in the Message, and cannot be denied, had the original power of imposing duties on imports. It is now transferred to the Government of the Union, in the most ample manner. Had the States retained it, they must have exercised it as they pleased, to accomplish any object they deemed proper. It might have been for revenue alone. It might have been employed *solely* to counteract the selfish policy of other States or nations. It could have been exercised for any purpose which suited the pleasure of sovereign power. But the States have delegated their whole power over imports to the United States. It would indeed be a strange anomaly if it could not now be exercised by the Government to which it has been transferred, as fully as it could have been by the States from which it was derived.

The President has declared, that, "while the *chief object* of duties should be revenue, they may be so adjusted as to encourage manufactures." It seems to the Committee that this remark is in plain collision with the sentiments which he has previously maintained. He has observed that the authority to impose duties on imports having passed from the States, "the right to exercise it for the purpose of *protection* does not exist in *them*." If it is "not possessed by the General Government, it must be extinct." "Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of a right to foster their own industry, and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which could be adopted by foreign nations." If revenue alone is wanted, duties for that object should be imposed. If protection to domestic industry is required, let duties be imposed to "foster it." Why should the *chief* object be revenue—why protection *secondary*—when the Treasury may be full? Many, now, apprehend that our revenue is, and will be, too abundant. But protection "against the most selfish and destructive policy of foreign nations" can be secured by duties on imports. By them alone. Then they should be adjusted to secure protection. This should be the *primary* object. The protecting power having once belonged to the States, and now transferred to the General Government, it may be used as the good of the nation demands, for a primary, not a secondary, object. It ought not to be loosely attached to the skirts of revenue. Domestic industry is a single, great, even pre-eminent interest, of the nation. It has been entrusted to the guardian care of the Constitution. It now demands the exercise of that power which the States have surrendered, for its promotion and preservation.

The President in his Message, further observes, that in the adjustment of protecting duties, the Government should be "guided by the general good." As an abstract proposition, this may be admitted. "The general interest is the interest of each; and it is only necessary that that interest should be understood, to ensure the cordial support of some who think "it encourages abuses which ought to be corrected, and promotes injustice which ought to be obviated." He also advises Congress that objects of national importance ought alone to be protected. Of these, the productions of our soil, our mines, and our workshops, "essential to national defence, occupy the first rank. Whatever other species of domestic industry, having the importance to which I have referred, may be expected, after temporary protection, to compete with foreign labor on equal terms, merit the same attention in a subordinate degree." Suppose the opinion to be correct, "that objects of *national* importance ought alone to be protected," what then? The President has not, by this general expression, afforded the least aid in adjusting the details of a protecting tariff. If the action of government could be confined to abstract rules and principles, little difference of opinion would probably exist in the nation. The great embarrassment is found in making an application of excellent theory to practical and useful purposes. The protecting system, the tariff, is composed of humble items. These, united, make up the great mass of national industry. Had the President been pleased to designate a few items only which he supposed to possess "national importance," or had he pointed out what "comforts of life are taxed unnecessarily high—what are the interests too local and minute to justify a general exaction, which it undertakes to protect, and what kind of manufactures for which the country is not ripe, it attempts to force," we should then have the light and benefit of illustration.

General theory may be adopted with perfect unanimity. Its application to real use, its coming down to the every day exertion of our farmers and mechanics, is a different affair. Under general theory, any one can make a retreat and maintain that it has been done with consistency and honor. Theory is best explained by its application to the axe, the plough, the hammer, and the spindle. The Chief Magistrate presides over a people who are engaged in unceasing and untiring industry. Congress has for years, and on repeated occasions, exercised its wisdom on the Tariff. Its best efforts have been made. If errors exist, it would seem reasonable to expect that the Chief Magistrate, looking abroad from his high station over all the interests of the country, and observing their mutual relations and dependencies, should intimate to the representatives of the people, what particular business of life has been too warmly cherished—what too coldly neglected. In adjusting the details of the Tariff, Congress has done what it deemed best for the general good. To reach the employments of life, it must go down to particulars. If the President is still dissatisfied, it might have been hoped that he would have designated the precise error. It will always be borne in mind, by practical men, and they compose the mass of the nation, that abstract theory, however splendid, does but little good, unless it comes to the aid of every muscle of labor. In what consists the defect of the existing Tariff? Individuals may discover imperfections, but the collected wisdom of the nation has repeatedly declared that material change is not demanded. Nothing better, under existing circumstances, can be done. Then let doubt and uncertainty be avoided. They are evils next to the surrender of the whole system.

The Message advises Congress that "objects of national importance alone ought to be protected. Of these, the productions of our soil, our mines, and our workshops, essential to national defence, occupy the first rank." It is to be presumed that Congress has not been unmindful of productions "essential to national defence." But the President says, "the present tariff taxes some of the comforts of life unnecessarily high." They are not defined. In the minds of many, what might be essential to national defence, might also promote the comforts of life. If the Message meant only guns, powder, and bullets, difference of opinion, even then might exist, as to the extent of protection, which ought to be afforded to the various elements of which they are composed. Its practical meaning is, therefore, obscure. Iron, it is presumed, would be considered essential to "national defence," and being the product of "our mines," should be protected. But that protection which would produce the material for a musket, would also furnish it for axes and ploughs. A duty that would give us domestic bullets, is all that might be required to supply the country with domestic lead for every use. But are muskets, and powder, and bullets, *all* that may be essential to "national defence?" An army might be most abundantly provided with these, and yet be totally inefficient in the field, if it wanted hats, and coats, and shirts, and sheets, and blankets. The condition of our country during the last war, furnished a well defined illustration of this sentiment. Various manufactures, *then*, were considered of national importance, which the doctrines of free trade *now* erase from the catalogue. But a duty imposed for promoting the domestic manufacture of these articles, for military purposes alone, would be an anomaly in the annals of any nation. That protecting policy which could supply the wants of an Army in War, must be allowed to operate in peace. Hence the difficulty of any classification of interests, while all are distinctly and equally governed by the same great constitutional power derived from the States. It is also to be remembered that peace with the world, is the natural condition of this country. It is not the foreign bayonet that we have the most reason to apprehend: it is the "selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by other nations." To guard against this is an object of "national importance." For peace or war the protecting policy is equally adapted, and it is believed, by the Committee, that the best preparation for national defence may be found in the vigorous cultivation of the arts of peace. Our people ought not to be perpetually dependent on orders in council or decrees of Emperors. Our country ought not to wait, until invasion surrounds it, and then beg blankets from invaders, to warm a shivering army, engaged in "national defence."

The President alludes to another species of industry, leaving the importance to which he before had referred, and which may be expected, after "temporary protection, to compete with foreign labor on equal terms." This species of industry, in his opinion, merits "the *same* attention, in a *subordinate* degree," while, in speaking of objects "essential to national defence," he prescribes no limitation, either as to the extent of protection, or its duration. The other class, he considers, entitled to the "same attention," yet qualified by the expression, in "a *subordinate* degree." This qualification seems to render it difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain the extent of the rule which he has adopted for his own action, and the guidance of Congress. Instead of opening a luminous pathway, in which all branches of the Government may move on in unison and safety, new embarrassments appear to be added to those already encountered by Congress in adjusting the detailed provisions of the tariff. It would seem to be the meaning of the President, that, after a temporary protection has been extended to a manufacture for a reasonable period, if it "cannot then compete with foreign labor on equal terms," it does not merit protection. This doctrine has been repeatedly advanced in Congress, and the Committee presume it to be the doctrine of the Message. But it will not stand the test of experiment. Prior to the late war, the coarse muslins consumed in the United States, were imported from India, and cost the consumer about *twenty-five cents the yard*. By the war the supply was cut off—our cotton mills began to move, and a partial supply was furnished. At its close, when the India cottons were again imported, most of these establishments were ruined. By the tariff of 1816, establishing what was called the minimum duty on coarse cottons, the home market was effectually secured to our own manufacturers. Under its fostering influence, they have flourished and multiplied; and such have been our improvements in skill, and labor, and machinery, that the consumer, instead of paying *twenty-five* cents, now purchases at home a much better article for *eight* cents the yard. Large exportations of them are made to foreign countries. They are carried to India, China, and South America, where they are sold to advantage. But suppose the protecting duty withdrawn, and the American manufacturer left to "compete with foreign labor on equal terms." Admit the cottons of India, England, and Scotland, and what would be the effect? Within two years not a single cotton mill in the United States would be in motion. The immense capital invested in them, amounting to many millions, would be utterly sunk to the country, and their owners irretrievably ruined. And why? Not because we cannot make goods as cheap as in Manchester and Glasgow, but because a war would be waged by British capital against American capital—a war of *extermination*. Such a war has been waged upon every article of American industry, whenever the protecting duty has been inadequate, or the law extending the duty so framed, that the mercantile cupidity, and the cunning of foreign manufacturers, could evade it.

There is another rule laid down by the President, which the Committee have thought proper to examine. It is contained in the expression, that "objects of national importance alone ought to be protected." The Committee will not here enter into a discussion of the question, whether Congress may not protect objects *local* in character. The States, in their original independence, before the adoption of the Constitution, could have used the power of imposing duties on imports for the express purpose of protecting *local objects*, according to the doctrine entertained by the President, in which the Committee fully concur. The several States no longer possess that power. Where is it? Where has it fled? On what shelf is it laid? The Government of the Union possesses it, or it has become "extinct." If an object *did* present itself, purely local in its character, and its protection was demanded by the prosperity and happiness of a single State, and this could be *best* done, or done *only*, by the delegated power from the States to impose duties on imports, it should be well considered, before Congress rejected a proposition for that purpose. The discussion of this subject, at this time, is not intended. It may, however, be intimated, that it is the duty of the General Government to protect every State, county, and town, in the Union, from invasion.

The Government of the Union is bound to protect every inch of our soil from a hostile bayonet. It has equal power to protect every finger of domestic industry against foreign competition. Let it be firmly exercised. It matters but little to real national independence, whether foreign guns, or foreign labor, conquer us. However this may be considered, it is fully believed, by the Committee, that the present tariff, taken together, or in the minutest detail, is national in its character, although the language of the President may seem to imply, that, in this respect, it is defective. He has also told us, in his Message, that "it is an infirmity of our nature, to mingle our interests and prejudices, with the operation of our reasoning powers, and attribute to the objects of our likes and dislikes, qualities they do not possess, and effects they cannot produce;" that our deliberations on this interesting subject, should be uninfluenced "by partisan conflicts," and should not be made subservient "to the short sighted views of faction." The Committee have a due regard, both to the admonition and the sug-

timents expressed by the President; and they also entertain a most ardent hope, that our fellow-citizens will keep a steady, searching eye on every movement of political ambition, in whatever quarter of our country it may appear. It may speak well and pleasantly to the public ear, in favor of a national protecting system, and yet, with a calm, fair, honest looking countenance, scatter such mysterious, yet captivating doubts, as to the value of its different provisions, that "small minorities" may be taught how to form a "combination" to overthrow it.

What gives national importance to an object or production of domestic industry? *How* is its national importance discovered? Whence derived? By what principle decided? Is it the *place* of production in the United States, that imparts to it the character of "*national* importance?" Must production be found in every narrow subdivision of the country? Must it, of necessity, be "*general, not local?*" Should the answer be in the affirmative, the concentrated wisdom of the Nation would never provide a protecting tariff. Our various soils, our different climates, our diversified objects of industry, would present an impassable barrier against the adoption of any system of protection. The farmer, who grows wheat, asks the aid of Government to protect that article. He knows that Poland, Russia, the Barbary States, and France, may furnish, at times, wheat cheaper on the seaboard than he can afford it.—When he asks protection an objection is made. Some portions of the Union do not produce wheat. Its production is not general. It must be rejected. Butter and cheese are presented for protection. Our farmers can produce them in abundance. The Irish tenant, who subsists on the humblest fare that unfeeling oppression deals out, may furnish them *cheaper* than the cultivators of *our* soil. Yet it is discovered that *portions* of our extended country are unable to produce butter and cheese. They cannot be protected. They are "*local*," and not *general*.

Iron is named. This is indispensable in peace and war. It may, perhaps, be, for a time, furnished by boors and serfs, laboring under the command of Russian and Swedish nobility, a little cheaper than the Pennsylvania and New Jersey freemen can produce it, and live as independent citizens ought to live in a free country. But iron is a "*local* object, not general." It must be rejected.

Hemp is named, an article so valuable to the independence of all branches of the navigation of our country. The strong arm of protection holds foreign navigation away from our domestic trade. It should unfurl American canvass with delight. It should also be well kept in mind that the great body of American consumers of foreign productions sustain navigation engaged in *foreign* commerce. The splendid ship that carries and brings is still subordinate to the interests of those who buy and use and pay for the cargo. The merchants on our seaboard may heap up wealth, build palaces, command the luxuries of life, but they must well keep in mind that they all owe their prosperity to the strong arm of labor. They owe it to the daily toil of our yeomanary, whether engaged in subduing the summits of the Green Mountains, or cultivating the glens of the Alleghany. Let, then, the hemp of Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee, be protected. Let the people of those States have a share in the advantages of that policy, which they are willing to defend. If it has so *happened*, that navigation, engaged in our foreign trade, is suffering from foreign competition, it is owing to itself. All which it asked for protection was freely granted. When it had gained such ascendancy, as it supposed would enable it to challenge foreign competition, it triumphantly told the Government that protection was no longer wanted. Hence treaty after treaty has been concluded for reciprocal navigation. This was urged by the advocates of free trade. If now it is a little crippled, if other nations supply us with a little more navigation, is it a greater evil than if foreigners supplied us with a little more iron, or hemp, or sugar, or cotton, or woollens? Must the great system of protection be abandoned, because navigation has been indulged in its wish, and has been *somewhat* disappointed? The advocates of free trade ought rather to rejoice that our interest is free from the fetters of protection.

If foreign nations can build ships cheaper than the people of the United States, why not cheerfully employ them? According to the doctrines of free trade, so much would be saved. But yet, if navigation wants assistance, there is every reason to believe that the power which protected its infancy, if desired, will come cheerfully again to its support, in every way and by all means consistent with the great interests of the country. But hemp is "*local*, not a *general*" production, and must therefore be rejected.

Sugar is proposed. It is an article of necessity, comfort, and luxury. It cannot be produced in Maine or Pennsylvania. Its production must be confined to the warm region of our country, where the great staples of other ports are uncongenial. But it must be rejected according to the rule. Its production is *local*—not *general*. The same may be said of cotton and wool, of every article named in the tariff. The greatest and most valuable productions of domestic industry are more or less local in their origin—not general. Hence, if the rule is, that every portion of the country must alike contribute to the production of an article which the Constitution will allow to be protected, there never can be a protecting tariff at all; human wisdom could not devise one which would confer the least benefit on the country.

The rule, that any particular object of domestic industry must possess "*national* importance," to entitle it to protection, may be safely adopted, if properly understood and applied. A broad view might be taken of the condition of the country, of its productions, of its various business, of its perpetually blending and mingling interests. We must see the mutual relations which exist between the narrowest sections of our country, and ascertain how widely, and generally, the various productions of domestic industry, are distributed amongst the people. We should ascertain, for the practical purpose of legislation, what articles of domestic industry, *great* or *small*, may be required for general use; what articles the people want; what their comfort and convenience demand; what articles are gathered up and distributed by the trade, business, and commerce of the country. The names of the articles may be humble—it may be broad cloths, wood-screws, thimbles, bar-iron, steam-engines, or the fabrics of cotton. But, whatever its name, the right of protection must be considered with reference to the great principles before mentioned.

The Committee must be fully convinced, that improvements can be made, or they cannot, with a proper respect to the "extended interests it involves," to hazard an effort. Such is the "infirmity of our natures," that the enemies of the protecting system would rejoice to have the benefit of "likes and dislikes," to aid them in their attacks. The President, also, expresses his opinion, that "the effects of the present tariff, are, doubtless, overrated, both in its evils and advantages." The Committee are confident, that its *evils* are most unreasonably "overrated." Its advantages are so manifest, that they have been, in the estimation of many, too greatly undervalued. The President advises us, that the decreased price of raw materials, manufactured articles, provisions, and lands, arises from a cause "deeper and more pervading than the tariff of the United States." He supposes "it may, in a measure, be attributable to the *increased value* of the precious metals."

The Committee are unable to say, how far this remark may apply to *other* countries. As applied to this country, it is clearly erroneous. Appreciation in any commodity, *gold*, silver, corn, or lumber, depends, in a great degree, on abundance or scarcity. If currency, whether composed of silver, gold, or bank notes, is plenty, the nominal price of all articles required for general consumption, will rise, because the owners of currency must use it for profit. The greater the plenty, the more it will be used. In such case, less profit will satisfy. This cause enhances the price of every thing that currency purchases, for it must, and will be employed. The precious metals are the base of our national currency. Our commercial operations are filled with them. Exchange on foreign nations was never lower; and if it *seems* to be against us, it is only because we have, *by law*, established a relative value between silver and gold, which the rest of the world will not adopt.

It cannot, therefore, be supposed, that the "*reduced* price" of domestic productions, is caused by "the increased value" of the precious metals. It is to be attributed to domestic competition, and to an addition to the great supply of the world; and, that the advance of the price of cotton, and the steady support of "other agricultural products," is owing to the diversified employments encouraged by the protecting system. Had the precious metals "increased in value," the benefits of the tariff would have been far more *conspicuous*. Prices would have been lower still. The tendency of such opinions of the President, as to the cause of the low prices of domestic manufactures, is to excite prejudice against the protecting system, to render it, in the estimation of our fellow-citizens, an object of little importance. The error of such opinions, the Committee consider it their duty to expose.

The President has informed us, that "the best, as well as the fairest mode of determining, whether, from any just considerations, a particular interest ought to receive protection, would be, to submit the question singly for consideration. If, after due examination of its merits, unconnected with extraneous considerations—*such as a desire* to sustain a general system, or to *purchase support for a different interest*—it should enlist in its favor a majority of the representatives of the people, there can be but little danger of wrong or injury in adjusting the tariff, with reference to its protective effect." The Committee pass over the caution against "extraneous considerations." That will be duly appreciated by the representatives of the people. The suggestions of the President, which relate to the *manner* in which a protecting tariff should be formed, the Committee believe, cannot be adopted. If such views had prevailed since the adoption of the Constitution, no tariff, for the protection of domestic industry, would have existed. If they now prevail, in all branches of the Government, the tariff has no escape from total destruction.

The framers of our Constitution were equally distinguished for their profound intelligence and purest patriotism. In their great design to provide a government for this Republic, which should promote and secure the various interests of every portion, did they adopt a single provision, but with open and avowed desire to make a general system? Did not every State present, in bold relief, its separate claims and interests? Was not each separate and distinct claim and interest presented by the different members of the Convention, and well considered by the whole? It was by uniting interests, great and small, scattered far and wide, that our system of Government was adopted. Had a "particular interest" been submitted, "singly," from some portion of the country, and that, alone, must have been regarded, the Convention must have been dissolved without giving it a glance of notice. But the members of that august assembly did make mutual concessions and compromises, in order to establish a general system. The President has advised Congress, that the power of protecting domestic industry, by the aid of duties on imports, belong to the General Government. This, all know, is secured by a Constitution, founded on liberal concessions and compromise. The Committee believe that the protecting power may be exercised, without exposure to impeachment for motives, on the same principles that governed the Convention which framed and recommended our Constitution, and the people who ratified it. The application of this protecting power must be made by the representatives of the people. There is no other way by which it can be exercised. Then, how can this be done? How can it be brought down, home, to business and bosom? If a blacksmith asks the Government of the Union to protect the manufacture of an axe, must this question be submitted "singly" for deliberation? Must a separate bill be introduced, and a vote of Congress taken? Shall abstract theory place the seal of silence on the lips of the blacksmith, and forbid him to say that he wishes the forge, the loom, and the sugar plantation also to be protected? The consequences are too plain for extensive commentary. The great interests of the nation will hold generous communion among themselves. They will make common cause; they will make mutual concessions, compromises, and even sacrifices, to promote the general welfare, in imitation of the example set by the great founders of our Government. Different interests have a right to consult each other. They will do so. They have always done so. They must and will act in concert, if they expect to exist. Mutual aid may be required by the civil interests of the country, as much as mutual assistance was once required from the different States, at New Orleans or Plattsburgh. Statesmen, who understand human nature, must admit it. It is sanctioned by the purest examples of our country—of all countries. In the adjustment of the existing tariff, it might be presumed, by another branch of the Government, that Congress did its duty—that it did not improperly obtain support for different interests. It must still be kept in mind, that, if the infirmity of our nature rendered it defective in its origin, an attempt at revision might add to its imperfection.

American manufactures have had a long and arduous conflict with the popular, yet delusive, doctrine, that additional duties for their protection are taxes on the consumer, and that every man who wears a coat pays the duty imposed, into the pocket of the manufacturer. The Committee will not go into any train of reasoning to show its fallacy. They will merely advert to a few facts; and they congratulate the friends of the American System, that the memory of every man in the nation can furnish abundant evidence, that, in all cases where the material is found at home, and the protecting duty has been adequate, the domestic article becomes cheaper in price, and improved in quality. Cotton goods furnish a striking example of this truth, and every man who wears a cotton shirt knows it. The article of nails furnishes another proof, as is well known to every man who builds a house. The Committee might enumerate hundreds of articles, such as hats, caps, shoes, boots, and cheese, to sustain them, but they know it would be superfluous. The tax is not paid, because the articles are not imported. The duty secures the market to the home manufacturer, and domestic competition among the manufacturers reduces the cost to the lowest possible price, while, at the same time, it improves the quality. This is the plain truth of the matter; and it is so well understood by the great mass of the nation, that the American System will not be surrendered nor abandoned, so long as the people select their own rulers. It has taken deep root in our soil—the tree is flourishing, its branches have extended far and wide, and the people will frown indignantly upon every effort to wither its leaf, or to blast its fruit.

The President having, in the proper exercise of his duty, submitted to Congress his views on the tariff, and these having been referred to the Committee on Manufactures, it became the Committee to give them a candid and respectful consideration. This they have endeavored to do. Being representatives of the people, they have no apology to make for the freedom with which the opinions of the Chief Magistrate, on this interesting and delicate debate, have been examined.

In framing the tariff, they believe that the acknowledged principles of the Constitution have been applied as faithfully as "Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe," could have desired: that the present tariff, although it may be defective in parts, is adjusted on principles which those great statesmen approved. Had *they* been employed to consider its details, and adapt them to the present condition of our country, and the world, and their united wisdom had been exerted, every one might have discovered "imperfections in many of its parts;" yet, as a system, *all* of them would, most cheerfully, have given in their powerful and hearty support. They understood the "infirmity of our nature" too well to designate a *single* interest, and trust it to a *single* consideration. They would have made all interests that required protection come forth together, stand side by side, and then provide a system, by which all could be mutually sustained.

The Committee are satisfied that the provisions of the existing Tariff are national in their character; that no interest, which it has undertaken to protect, is "too minute;" that it contains no evidence of attempts "to force manufactures for which the country is not ripe," of sufficient importance to require revision; that "no comforts of life are taxed unnecessarily high," with a proper regard to revenue and protection; that the "low prices of manufactured articles" have not been caused by the "increased value of the precious metals, which were never before so abundant and cheap in the United States; but, that the low prices of manufactured articles are caused, in a great degree, by the existing Tariff, which has made the labor, skill, and enterprize, of our people, add a vast supply for consumption to the stores of the world.

The Committee fully believe that the present general prosperity of the country is mainly to be attributed to the protecting system, and if our fellow-citizens can retain full faith and confidence, that our Government will firmly execute its repeated and solemn promises; that it will maintain the high assurance of support which our people have a right to demand from its dignity and honor, their prosperity will be daily and more rapidly promoted, and the resources of our country more and more amply developed.

The Committee repeat that they cannot concur in the opinion of the President, that in framing a protecting Tariff, each interest should be presented "singly for deliberation," without any reference to a general system. By such a rule, it is believed, that no protecting system could ever have been adopted, and by its influence, it is strongly apprehended, none can stand. The fears of the Committee are the more explicitly declared, because enemies of the system have, in a manner that cannot be misunderstood, exposed their plan of operations. It is, to present each object "singly" for deliberation, and conquer the whole system in detail.

The Committee have thus presented to the House their undisguised and undissembled opinions on the subject referred, "with the freedom and candor which they considered the occasion for their expression" required.

They believe that the tariff, having been so recently revised, any attempt to change its provisions, at this time, would spread alarm among the great interests of our country, shake confidence in the plighted faith of Government, destroy the supposed well-founded hopes of millions of our fellow-citizens, reduce them to penury, and expose the whole country to the dangers of a "most selfish policy which might be adopted by foreign nations."

PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 22, 1831.

SENATE.—Mr. SMITH, of Maryland, presented a memorial, praying for the erecting of a Light House on either side of the harbor of Baltimore.

Mr. WOODBURY presented a petition from sundry citizens in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, praying a repeal of duties on nails manufactured from imported iron: It was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Impeachment.—The Senate was then formed into the Court of Impeachment, by the usual proclamation by the Marshal, and Mr. Meredith addressed the Court in continuation.

The learned gentleman finally concluded his argument, (this being the fourth day on which he has addressed the Court without intermission,) at 20 minutes past one. The line of argument which he thus finished, consisted of four propositions, which were laid down at the commencement. They were, in effect—

1st. That the Court (Judge Peck's) had power to punish contempt.

2d. That the publication of Mr. Lawless was a contempt of Court.

3d. That the punishment (the 2d proposition assumed as proved) inflicted on Mr. L. was justifiable; and,

4th. That even if the publication did not amount to a contempt, that Judge Peck had erred through good motives, and that no malice was proved.

When Mr. MEREDITH had concluded, Mr. WIRT rose and addressed the Court for a considerable time, with his usual eloquence. He had only got through the exordium of his Speech, when, on the motion of Mr. WEBSTER, the Court adjourned till Monday.

HOUSE.—The SPEAKER laid before the House certain resolutions from the Executive of North Carolina, on the subject of Roanoke Inlet; and they were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The Tariff.—The SPEAKER also laid before the House a memorial from certain citizens of Ohio, praying for a revision of the Tariff; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

On motion of Mr. SILL, (by the unanimous consent of the House) it was

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be directed to inquire into the expediency of making an appropriation for erecting a beacon light on the North Pier, at the entrance of the harbor of Presque Isle; also into the expediency of making an appropriation for the surveys of the mouth of Elk Creek, and the harbor of ——— at the mouth of 16 mile Creek on Lake Erie, with a view to the construction of harbors at each of those places respectively.

On motion of Mr. DODDRIDGE, it was

Resolved, That the Committee on Internal Improvements be instructed to inquire into the expediency of making an appropriation for improving the mail stage road from Uniontown, in Pennsylvania, through Morgantown and Clarksburg, to the Ohio river in the State of Virginia.

Mr. HODGES offered the following resolution, which lies one day on the table:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to inform this House what measures have been taken by the Executive in relation to the capture, on the 4th of July, 1829, of the sloop Galatea, late of the port of New Bedford, by a Portuguese naval squadron, then blockading the Island of Terceira; and also in relation to the imprisonment and robbery of the crew of said ship, and to the capture of other American vessels under the same order of blockade.

Resolved, That the Secretary be requested to lay before this House any correspondence that may have been had touching this matter, within the knowledge or possession of the Secretary.

Impeachment.—The House then resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and went to the Senate to attend the trial of Judge Peck.

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1831.

SENATE.—Mr. BENTON presented the petition of the Corporation of the City of St. Louis, Missouri, praying the aid of Congress, by an appropriation, to erect and support an hospital in or near that city, for the use of disabled seamen. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BENTON from the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which he said he was instructed by the majority, reported the bill, without amendment, to reduce the duties on Indian Blankets and certain other Indian goods not manufactured in the United States.

Impeachment.—The Senate again sat as a Court of Impeachment. Mr. WIRT then resumed his argument, commenced on Saturday.

HOUSE.—*Judiciary Act.*—Mr. WARREN R. DAVIS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, made a report, accompanied by a bill *to repeal the twenty-fifth section of the Act, entitled "An Act to establish the Judicial Courts of the United States,"* passed in the year 1789.

The question being on the first reading of the bill—

Mr. BUCHANAN rose to present the report of the minority of the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER decided that this was not in order while a motion for the first reading of the bill was before the House.

The bill was then read a first time by its title.

Mr. HUNTINGTON asked for the reading of the bill.

The bill was then read, consisting of a single section, which simply repeals the section described in the title.

Mr. DODDRIDGE and Mr. BUCHANAN rose together, when the former moved the rejection of the bill, and asked for the Ayes and Noes on the question.

Mr. BUCHANAN requested of Mr. DODDRIDGE to withdraw his motion, to give him an opportunity to present the report of the minority of the Committee.

Mr. DODDRIDGE then withdrew his motion, but renewed it, on being informed by the Speaker that the presentation of the report would still be out of order, until the motion for the second reading, the rejection of which motion would be equivalent to rejection of the bill, should be disposed of.

The House then resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and went to the Senate to attend the trial of Judge Peck.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1831.

SENATE.—Mr. WEBSTER presented the petition of Robert S. Bunker and others, for a light house; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

A communication was received from the President of the United States, in relation to the protection of our fur trade, and the affairs of the Hudson Bay Company; which, on motion of Mr. BENTON, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SPRAGUE presented the memorial of certain merchants in the town of Portland, Maine, on the subject of a drawback on nails manufactured from foreign iron: Referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NOBLE presented the memorial of the Legislature of Indiana, praying for the continuance of the Cumberland Road.

The Trial.—The Senate then, on the motion of Mr. FOOT, resolved itself into a High Court of Impeachment.

Mr. WIRT continued his argument in defence of Judge Peck, which he concluded at 4 o'clock.

HOUSE.—Mr. HEMPHILL, from the Committee on Internal Improvements, reported a bill authorizing the Territory of Florida to open a canal through the public lands of West Florida.

The bill reported yesterday, by Mr. DAVIS, of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to repeal the 25th section of an act to establish the judicial courts of the United States, passed in September, 1789, was next taken up.

After some debate, Mr. BUCHANAN presented the Report of the minority of the Committee of the Judiciary on this question; which was ordered to be printed, together with the one submitted by the majority.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1831.

SENATE.—Mr. HENDRICKS, from the Committee on Roads and Canals, asked to be discharged from the further consideration of the memorial relating to the improvement of the Ohio and Monongahela rivers, and it was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The following resolution was submitted by Mr. HENDRICKS:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be instructed to inquire into the expediency of authorizing a survey of the mouth of Trail Creek, at the southern bend of Lake Michigan.

Judge Peck.—The Senate then went into a Court of Impeachment.

Mr. STORRS, of New York, one of the Managers on the part of the House of Representatives, addressed the Court, till the hour of its adjournment, at half past three o'clock.

HOUSE.—Mr. BROADHEAD presented a memorial from sundry citizens of the State of New Hampshire, praying for the allowance of a drawback on nails exported.

The Tariff.—The SPEAKER presented a memorial of citizens of the city and county of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, mechanics employed in the various branches of the manufacture of iron, (the same published in our paper of the 26th ult.) praying that such a modification of the existing tariff of duties on iron as therein set forth, may be adopted; which memorial was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. BOON introduced the following resolution; which was ordered to lie one day on the table:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to lay before this House any information in his possession, relating to a survey of the Wabash river, and the probable cost of removing the obstructions to the navigation of the same, below the termination of the contemplated canal, to connect, at navigable points, the waters of the Wabash river with those of Lake Erie.

The Tariff—Duty on Iron.—Mr SPEIGHT said he rose for the purpose of submitting a motion which he had never before made in that House. It was to reconsider the vote of this morning, on the question of the reference of the memorial which the Speaker had presented from the citizens of Philadelphia, in relation to the tax on iron. The right of petition belonged to every citizen of the United States, and the petitions of any members of the community were entitled to be treated with respect. He did not, in saying this, mean to censure the commitment of the petition to the Committee on Manufactures, and still less to say that that Committee was not competent to decide upon the subject; but he did mean to say that the reference was an improper one in one point of view, inasmuch as a majority of that Committee, it was well known, was opposed, not only to a diminution of the tax on iron, but to a reduction of the duties on almost every other article also. The Committee on Manufactures had prejudged the whole case; and had, at this very session, presented to the House a long and elaborate Report in support of the American System. Now he asked if this could be considered as giving to the memorial that direction which its importance demanded? It came before them as a question which demanded much respect and consideration. It asked the House to repeal an oppressive tax upon an article which of necessity entered into the consumption of every farmer in the Union, be he poor or rich, and indeed of every member of every other class in the community.

Mr. SPEIGHT continued, by observing, that the House, it was true, might dispose of the question as they pleased, but he would repeat that it was of a nature worthy of their grave consideration. The object of petitioning this House was to obtain a redress of grievances; and the course which ought to be taken in respect to such a measure, was one that would ensure its passing in such a direction as was most likely to ensure a free, fair, and full discussion of its merits. He concluded by moving a reconsideration of the vote of the House this morning, with a view to have the memorial referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RAMSEY hoped that the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina for reconsideration would not prevail. The subject embraced in the memorial manifestly belonged to the express duties of the Committee on Manufactures, consequently that Committee was its appropriate reference.

But the gentleman from North Carolina, (Mr. SPEIGHT,) speaks of the impropriety of referring the subject to a committee, the majority of which had already decided on the principles involved in it; that they have prejudged the subject, and therefore ought not to have a cognizance of it. Now, sir, said Mr. R., I would ask the gentleman if the very objection which he urges against the Committee on Manufactures is not equally applicable to the Committee of Ways and Means, because this Committee also has prejudged the subject. He could consent to no change of the ordinary course of reference in the present case. The subject embraced in the memorial, as he had said before, belonged to the Committee on Manufactures; and if this course is deviated from, the gentleman from North Carolina may as well move its reference to the Committee on Claims, or any other Committee of the House, as the Committee of Ways and Means This Committee was created for the express purpose of providing for, or rather distributing the means of supporting the functionaries of the Government, in the legal discharge of the duties imposed on them. He hoped that the motion would not prevail; and that the memorial should remain where it was, in charge of the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. McDUFFIE said that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. RAMSEY,) was correct in stating that the Committee of Ways and Means had as certainly prejudged the case of the petitioners as the Committee on Manufactures. He agreed that both of these Committees were obnoxious to this objection in the same degree; for it could hardly be doubted that the former would be in favor of the prayer of the petitioners, and the latter opposed to it.

But he understood the gentleman from North Carolina to have objected to the Committee of Manufactures upon the established parliamentary rule, that a measure or a petition should not be committed to a Committee who would certainly report unfavorably, and thus preclude the House from giving the subject a full and impartial consideration. Now, said Mr. McDUFFIE, one of the petitioners, (a Mr. Sarchet,) who I believe to be one of the most intelligent mechanics in the United States, *and well qualified to give lessons of practical wisdom on this subject, by which statesmen may profit*, is at this time in the city, prepared, with various models and specimens of manufactured articles, to illustrate the inequality and injustice of the existing tariff on raw iron, as compared with that on manufactures of iron. He is desirous of appearing before whatever Committee shall be charged with the petition, to explain the objects of the petitioners, and to give testimony of facts in verification of their statements. My object in rising, therefore, is to inquire of the Honorable Chairman of the Committee on Manufactures, whether he is willing to give a full hearing to the gentleman I have named, that his statements and testimony may be presented to this House. If, as I do not doubt, the Committee on Manufactures will pursue that course, I feel indifferent, said Mr. McDUFFIE, to which Committee the petition shall be referred.

Mr. MALLARY said, that he thought the subject should take the course assigned to it by the former vote of the House. The rule of the House was, that the various questions submitted to it should be referred to the different Committees, and as to the fact of a Committee, or the majority of a Committee, being for or against any particular measure, why surely that was not for the presiding officer to determine in the selection of the members. The simple question was, what were the duties of the Committee, and how they were required to perform them; if erroneous in their reports, the ill effects of their errors were checked by the action of the House upon them. The prejudgement of a case had been spoken of; but that might perhaps be equally applicable to both of the Committees which had been named. The same reasoning might be used to prevent the reference of the memorial to either of them.

Mr. MILLER briefly expressed his sentiments on the subject. The memorial was similar in purport to one submitted last year, which went to reduce the duty on iron. He thought the reference should be most properly to the Committee on Manufactures. A proposition like the present one, he should feel it his duty to oppose, from whatever quarter it came.

Mr. CAMBRELENG observed, that after the declaration of the Chairman of the Committee on Manufactures, (Mr. MALLARY,) that this subject should be fully investigated, he hoped the gentleman from North Carolina, (Mr. SPEIGHT,) would withdraw his motion to reconsider. He, Mr. C., understood the gentleman from Vermont to say that, as a member and as Chairman of the Committee on Manufactures, he would devote himself to the subject of the memorial; that he would hear the manufacturers, and weigh the whole subject with just deliberation; and he hoped that the evidence would be reported to the House. Mr. C. considered this memorial one of the most important presented for our consideration, as it would illustrate the extraordinary principles of the tariff actually existing. It was, besides, a memorial from manufacturers themselves. It was addressed, too, to gentlemen who claimed to be the peculiar protectors of the manufacturing industry of the country—to gentlemen who had so recently told us that our tariff was too perfect to be amended or even touched. The examination of this branch of our manufacturing industry will show with what truth this declaration has been made and promulgated. The memorial proceeds, not from the consumers, nor from any other branch of industry, but from the mechanics and manufacturers themselves. Let the Committee examine them. The memorial tells you, in the face of the report of the Committee, that you have taxed the raw materials which they use in their manufactures twice and thrice the amount of the duty on the foreign manufactured article, when imported; that they cannot stand your system; and that, if you do not give them relief, by reducing the duty on the raw material, their manufactures, the iron manufactures of the country, must perish. Mr. C. said he would not go further into the merits of the memorial. He was happy to hear the declaration of the gentleman from Vermont, that those who represent this branch of industry should be heard; and he concluded by hoping that the gentleman from North Carolina would withdraw his motion.

Mr. HALL, of North Carolina, moved the previous question, but withdrew his motion for the purpose of permitting Mr. HUNTINGTON to make an observation.

The House refused to sustain the call for the previous question.

Mr. BARBOUR, of Virginia, said that he rose to trouble the House with a very brief remark. He was a member of the Committee on Manufactures, and his posture there was peculiar; for he was the only member of that Committee who was hostile to the system of protective duties, as it was famingly called. So situated towards the Committee, he could bear evidence to its diligence and ability, with great propriety. He felt so thoroughly persuaded of the fidelity of that Committee to its duties, that he would now take the liberty of asking the gentleman from North Carolina to withdraw his motion.

Mr. B. said he would seize the present occasion to remark, that two reports had been presented from the Committee at the present session; the one from the majority, and the other from the minority. He said that he dissented from each of those reports, and that it was just to himself, and proper in itself, from various considerations, thus publicly to announce that dissent.

Mr. SPEIGHT said, he had no wish, indeed it was far from his disposition, to reflect on the course which has been pursued by the Committee on Manufactures, in the report which they had already submitted to the House. They had done, no doubt, what they considered their duty; he only observed, that as this Committee had reported unfavorably as to any change in the impost duty now levied on any article of consumption, that they had, therefore, prejudged the subject now about to be referred: and hence it would be useless to refer it to them for the purpose of having its merits investigated, in order to be reported on to this House; that, under such circumstances, their minds having been made up, and their decision committed to this House, it could not be expected that this Committee should now give it that impartial investigation which it demanded. But, as the Honorable Chairman of that Committee (Mr. MALLARY,) has since declared, that if this subject be referred to them, he, as one of the Committee, will give it a full, a fair, and impartial investigation, he, Mr. S., would, therefore, withdraw his motion.

The reference of the memorial was, therefore, to the Committee on Manufactures, the course which it had originally taken.

Manufacture of Sugar.—On motion of Mr. SPENCER, of New York, 3000 copies of the Report of the Treasury Department, on the subject of the manufacture of sugar, were ordered to be printed.

SUGAR IMPORTED.

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,

Communicating the information required by a Resolution of the House of Representatives of the 14th inst., in relation to Brown Sugars imported into the United States, from 30th Dec. 1815, &c. &c.

December 31, 1830.—*Read and laid upon the table.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, 29th Dec. 1830.

Sir: In compliance with a Resolution of the House of Representatives of the 14th inst., requesting the Secretary of the Treasury "to communicate to the House, first, a statement of the quantity of White and Brown Sugar (distinguishing Muscovado from clayed) imported annually into the United States, from the 30th of September, 1815, and the amount of duty collected upon the same; second, a statement of the quantity of Sugar exported in each year, and the amount of drawback paid upon the same, specifying the quantity of Muscovado, clayed, white, and brown, and refined sugar exported, and the drawback paid upon each description, respectively," I have the honor to transmit statements Nos. 1 to 5, which contain the information requested, as far as it is afforded by the records of the Department, there being no discrimination in the returns between Muscovado and other sugars.

The years embraced in these statements are calendar years, ending on the 31st of December.

I have the honor to remain, with high respect, your obedient servant,

S. D. INGHAM, *Secretary of the Treasury.*

The Honorable the SPEAKER
of the House of Representatives of the U. States.

STATEMENTS exhibiting the quantity of brown, white, clayed, or powdered Sugar, and of refined Sugars, imported and exported; together with the amount of duties which accrued on the import, and of drawback payable on the export, during the years ending on the 31st December, 1815, to 1829, inclusive.

NO. 1.—BROWN SUGAR.

Years ending 31st Dec.	Imported.		Exported, entitled to drawback.	
	Pounds.	Duties.	Pounds.	Drawback payable.
1815	52,845,088	$2,642,254 40	3,040,780	$146,717 62
1816	48,550,282	1,796,271 44	15,962,043	720,791 42
1817	83,274,871	2,498,247 54	20,849,095	610,167 20
1818	61,474,616	1,844,238 48	13,223,998	386,799 89
1819	78,847,629	2,365,428 60	10,356,345	302,923 11
1820	73,903,829	2,217,114 60	25,286,791	739,638 65
1821	54,826,207	1,644,786 21	14,348,041	419,680 19
1822	77,641,240	2,329,237 20	7,308,512	213,768 14
1823	56,502,417	1,697,772 51	14,454,906	422,808 65
1824	84,077,593	2,522,327 79	10,999,772	321,674 57
1825	62,290,985	1,868,999 55	18,060,805	528,164 80
1826	80,956,081	2,428,682 43	11,843,896	346,433 96
1827	64,101,498	1,923,044 94	11,792,485	344,950 18
1828	53,671,743	1,610,152 29	8,712,122	254,829 58
1829	57,843,448	1,735,303 44	10,011,411	300,037 50

NO. 2.—WHITE, CLAYED OR POWDERED SUGAR.

Years ending 31st Dec.	Imported.		Exported, entitled to drawback.	
	Pounds.	Duties.	Pounds.	Drawback payable.
1815	5,819,741	$349,184 46	1,075,056	$62,245 74
1816	6,789,462	303,513 82	3,980,738	196,122 06
1817	7,374,643	294,985 72	4,209,174	165,056 52
1818	5,657,871	226,314 84	2,623,576	102,319 48
1819	4,251,411	170,056 44	1,077,285	42,014 13
1820	5,941,885	237,795 40	3,024,026	117,937 02
1821	6,612,236	264,490 64	4,158,843	161,194 87
1822	11,208,136	448,325 44	4,588,625	178,956 43
1823	7,006,112	280,244 48	5,834,058	227,528 26
1824	11,753,168	470,126 72	6,344,331	247,319 14
1825	8,402,751	336,110 04	5,137,898	200,339 12
1826	8,326,018	333,040 72	3,986,604	155,477 57
1827	5,501,634	220,065 36	2,687,132	104,798 13
1828	5,587,819	223,512 76	1,469,634	57,315 74
1829	4,297,847	171,913 88	1,065,377	42,475 20

NO. 3.—SUGAR CANDY.

Years ending 31st Dec.	Imported.		Exported, entitled to drawback.	
	Pounds.	Duties.	Pounds.	Drawback payable.
1815	344	$79 12		
1816	762	117 95		
1817	33,784	4,054 08	29,275	$3,425 17
1818	33,614	4,033 68	31,275	3,659 17
1819	20,563	2,467 56	17,357	2,030 77
1820	3,384	406 08	37	4 33
1821	2,665	319 80		
1822	3,911	469 32		
1823	1,599	199 88	461	53 94
1824	751	90 12	28	3 28
1825	718	86 16		
1826	491	58 92		
1827	272	32 64		
1828	64	7 68		
1829	645	77 40		

NO. 4.—LOAF SUGAR.

Years ending 31st Dec.	Imported.		Exported, entitled to drawback.	
	Pounds.	Duties.	Pounds.	Drawback payable.
1815	70,047	$12,608 46	531	$92 29
1816	15,922	2,627 22	3,737	637 78
1817	4,873	584 76	37,781	4,882 07
1818	1,542	185 04		
1819	2,082	249 84		
1820	898	107 76		
1821	276	33 12	713	83 42
1822	515	61 80		
1823	840	100 80		
1824	311	37 32		
1825	552	66 24	75	8 77
1826	1,866	323 92		
1827	347	41 64		
1828	314	37 68		
1829	1,079	129 48		

NO. 5.—OTHER REFINED SUGAR.

Years ending 31st Dec.	Imported.		Exported, entitled to drawback.	
	Pounds.	Duties.	Pounds.	Drawback payable.
1815	44,056	$5,727 28		
1816	243,313	31,580 74	201,514	$25,279 93
1817	698	69 80		
1818	1,061	106 10		
1819	956	95 60		
1820	563	56 30		
1821	465	46 50		
1822	342	34 20		
1823	574	57 40		
1824	151	15 10		
1825	140	14 00		
1826	623	62 30		
1827	61	6 10		
1828	59	5 90		
1829	44	4 40		

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *Register's Office, Dec.* 27, 1830.

T. L. SMITH, *Register.*

JOURNAL OF THE FEDERAL CONVENTION.

[*Continued from page* 69.]

SATURDAY, JUNE 16, 1787.

The order of the day being read—The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House, to consider of the state of the American Union. Mr. President left the Chair.

In Committee of the Whole House—Mr. Gorham in the Chair.

After some time passed in debate on the propositions offered by the Honorable Mr. Patterson—

It was moved and seconded that the Committee do now rise, report a further progress, and request leave to sit again.

The Committee then rose.

In the House.—Mr. President resumed the Chair.

Mr. Gorham reported, from the Committee—That the Committee had made a progress in the matter to them referred; and had directed him to move that they may have leave to sit again.

Resolved, That this House will, on Monday next, again resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House, to consider of the state of the American Union.

And then the House adjourned till Monday next, at 11 o'clock, A.M.

MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1787.

The order of the day being read—The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House, to consider of the state of the American Union. Mr. President left the Chair.

In Committee of the Whole House.—Mr. Gorham in the Chair.

It was moved by Mr. Dickinson, seconded by ——, to postpone the consideration of the first resolution submitted by Mr. Patterson, in order to introduce the following, namely:

"*Resolved*, That the Articles of Confederation ought to be revised and amended, so as to render the Government of the United States adequate to the exigencies, the preservation, and the prosperity, of the Union."

And, on the question to agree to the same—It passed in the affirmative.

Yeas—Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, —10.

Divided—Pennsylvania—1.

[See Colonel Hamilton's plan, below.]

It was then moved and seconded that the Committee do now rise, report a further progress, and request leave to sit again.

The Committee then rose.

In the House.—Mr President resumed the Chair.

Mr. Gorham reported, from the Committee—That the Committee had made a further progress in the matter to them referred; and had directed him to move that they may have leave to sit again.

Resolved, That this House will, to-morrow, again resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House, to consider of the state of the American Union.

COL. HAMILTON'S PLAN OF GOVERNMENT.

The following Paper was read by Col. Hamilton, as containing his ideas of a suitable Plan of Government for the United States, in a speech upon the foregoing motion of Mr. Dickinson.

[Paper furnished by Gen. Bloomfield.]

1. The supreme legislative power of the United States of America to be vested in two distinct bodies of men, the one to be called the Assembly, the other the Senate, who, together, shall form the Legislature of the United States, with power to pass all laws whatsoever, subject to the negative hereafter mentioned.

2. The Assembly to consist of persons elected by the people, to serve for three years.

3. The Senate to consist of persons elected to serve during good behaviour; their election to be made by electors, chosen for that purpose, by the people. In order to this, the States to be divided into election districts. On the death, removal, or resignation, of any Senator, the place to be filled out of the district from which he came.

4. The supreme executive authority of the United States to be vested in a Governor, to be elected to serve during good behaviour. His election to be made by electors chosen by electors, chosen by the people, in the election district aforesaid. His authorities and functions to be as follows:

To have a negative upon all laws about to be passed, and the execution of all laws passed; to have the entire direction of war, when authorized or begun; to have, with the advice and approbation of the Senate, the power of making all treaties; to have the sole appointment of the heads or chief officers of the Departments of Finance, War, and Foreign Affairs; to have the nomination of all other officers, (Ambassadors of foreign nations included,) subject to the approbation or rejection of the Senate; to have the power of pardoning all offences, except treason, which he shall not pardon without the approbation of the Senate.

5. On the death, resignation, or removal, of the Governor, his authorities to be exercised by the President of the Senate, until a successor be appointed.

6. The Senate to have the sole power of declaring war; the power of advising and approving all treaties; the power of approving or rejecting all appointments of officers, except the heads or chiefs of the departments of Finance, War, and Foreign Affairs.

7. The supreme judicial authority of the United States to be vested in —— Judges, to hold their offices during good behaviour, with adequate and permanent salaries. This court to have original jurisdiction in all cases of capture; and an appellative jurisdiction in all causes in which the revenues of the General Government, or the citizens of foreign nations, are concerned.

8. The Legislature of the United States to have power to institute Courts in each State, for the determination of all matters of general concern.

9. The Governors, Senators, and all officers of the United States, to be liable to impeachment for mal and corrupt conduct; and, upon conviction, to be removed from office, and disqualified for holding any place of trust or profit. All impeachments to be tried by a court to consist of the chief or senior Judge of the superior court of law in each State—provided, that such Judge hold his place during good behaviour, and have a permanent salary.

10. All laws of the particular States, contrary to the Constitution or Laws of the United States, to be utterly void. And, the better to prevent such laws being passed, the Governor or President of each State shall be appointed by the General Government, and shall have a negative upon the laws about to be passed in the State of which he is Governor or President.

11. No State to have any forces, land or naval; and the militia of all the States to be under the sole and exclusive direction of the United States; the officers of which to be appointed and commissioned by them.

TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 1787.

The order of the day being read—The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House, to consider of the state of the American Union. Mr. President left the Chair.

In Committee of the Whole House—Mr. Gorham in the Chair.

On the question to adopt Mr. Dickinson's motion, moved yesterday—It passed in the negative.

Yeas—Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware—4.

Nays—Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia—6.

Divided—Maryland—1.

It was then moved and seconded to postpone the consideration of the first proposition offered by Mr. Patterson.

It passed in the affirmative.

Yeas—Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia—9.

Nays—New York, New Jersey—2.

It was then moved and seconded that the Committee do now rise, and report to the House that they do not agree to the propositions offered by the Honorable Mr. Patterson; and that they report the resolutions offered by the Honorable Mr. Randolph, heretofore reported from a Committee of the Whole House.

Passed in the affirmative.

Yeas—Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia—7.

Nays—New York, New Jersey, Delaware—3.

Divided—Maryland—1.

The Committee then rose.

In the House—Mr. President resumed the Chair.

Mr. Gorham reported, from the Committee—That the Committee, having spent some time in the consideration of the propositions submitted to the House by the Honorable Mr. Patterson, and of the resolutions heretofore reported from a Committee of the Whole House, both of which had been to them referred, were prepared to report thereon; and had directed him to report to the House—That the Committee do not agree to the propositions offered by the Honorable Mr. Patterson; and that they again submit the resolutions, formerly reported, to the consideration of the House.

STATE OF THE RESOLUTIONS

Submitted to the consideration of the House, by the Hon. Mr. Randolph, as altered, amended, and agreed to, in Committee of the Whole House.

[Paper deposited, by Pres't Washington, in the Department of State.]

1. *Resolved*, That it is the opinion of this Committee that a National Government ought to be established, consisting of a supreme Legislative, Judiciary, and Executive.

2. *Resolved*, That the National Legislature ought to consist of two branches.

3. *Resolved*, That the members of the first branch of the National Legislature ought to be elected by the people of the several States, for the term of three years; to receive fixed stipends, by which they may be compensated for the devotion of their time to public service, to be paid out of the National Treasury; to be ineligible to any office established by a particular State, or under the authority of the United States, (except those peculiarly belonging to the functions of the first branch,) during the term of service, and under the National Government, for the space of one year after its expiration.

4. *Resolved*, That the members of the second branch of the National Legislature ought to be chosen by the individual Legislatures; to be of the age of thirty years at least; to hold their offices for a term sufficient to insure their independency, namely, seven years; to receive fixed stipends, by which they may be compensated for the devotion of their time to public service, to be paid out of the National Treasury; to be ineligible to any office established by a particular State, or under the authority of the United States, (except those peculiarly belonging to the functions of the second branch,) during the term of service, and under the National Government, for the space of one year after its expiration.

5. *Resolved*, That each branch ought to possess the right of originating acts.

6. *Resolved*, That the National Legislature ought to be empowered to enjoy the legislative rights vested in Congress by the Confederation; and, moreover, to legislate in all cases to which the separate States are incompetent, or in which the harmony of the United States may be interrupted by the exercise of individual legislation; to negative all laws, passed by the several States, contravening, in the opinion of the National Legislature, the Articles of Union, or any treaties subsisting under the authority of the Union.

7. *Resolved*, That the right of suffrage in the first branch of the National Legislature ought not to be according to the rule established in the Articles of Confederation, but according to some equitable ratio of representation, namely: in proportion to the whole number of white and other free citizens and inhabitants, of every age, sex, and condition, including those bound to servitude for a term of years, and three-fifths of all other persons not comprehended in the foregoing description, except Indians not paying taxes, in each State.

8. *Resolved*, That the right of suffrage in the second branch of the National Legislature ought to be according to the rule established for the first.

9. *Resolved*, That a National Executive be instituted, to consist of a single person; to be chosen by the National Legislature, for the term of seven years; with power to carry into execution the national laws; to appoint to offices in cases not otherwise provided for; to be ineligible a second time; and to be removable, on impeachment and conviction of mal-practice, or neglect of duty; to receive a fixed stipend, by which he may be compensated for the devotion of his time to public service, to be paid out of the National Treasury.

10. *Resolved*, That the National Executive shall have a right to negative any legislative act, which shall not be afterwards passed, unless by two-third parts of each branch of the National Legislature.

11. *Resolved*, That a National Judiciary be established, to consist of one supreme tribunal; the Judges of which to be appointed by the second branch of the National Legislature; to hold their offices during good behaviour; to receive, punctually, at stated times, a fixed compensation for their services, in which no increase or diminution shall be made, so as to affect the persons actually in office at the time of such increase or diminution.

12. *Resolved*, That the National Legislature be empowered to appoint inferior tribunals.

13. *Resolved*, That the jurisdiction of the National Judiciary shall extend to cases which respect the collection of the national revenue; impeachment of any national officers; and questions which involve the national peace and harmony.

14. *Resolved*, That provision ought to be made for the admission of States, lawfully arising within the limits of the United States, whether from a voluntary junction of government and territory, or otherwise, with the consent of a number of voices, in the National Legislature, less than the whole.

15. *Resolved*, That provision ought to be made for the continuance of Congress and their authorities, until a given day after the reform of the Articles of Union shall be adopted; and for the completion of all their engagements.

16. *Resolved*, That a Republican Constitution, and its existing laws, ought to be guarantied to each State by the United States.

17. *Resolved*, That provision ought to be made for the amendment of the Articles of Union, whensoever it shall seem necessary.

18. *Resolved*, That the Legislative, Executive, and Judiciary powers, within the several States, ought to be bound, by oath, to support the Articles of Union.

19. *Resolved*, That the amendments which shall be offered to the Confederation, by the Convention, ought, at a proper time, or times, after the approbation of Congress, to be submitted to an assembly or assemblies of representatives, recommended by the several Legislatures, to be expressly chosen, by the people, to consider and decide thereon.

It was then moved and seconded to postpone the consideration of the first resolution reported from the Committee, till to-morrow.

And on the question to postpone—It passed in the affirmative.

And then the House adjourned till to-morrow at 11 o'clock, A. M.

BROKEN BANKS.—We have seen advertisements of persons wishing to purchase the notes of broken banks. A gentleman from Liverpool informs us that there are shops in which Derby Bank notes, and other broken banks, are sold to emigrants visiting this country. This is so shameful a fraud, that every American should unite in ferreting out the perpetrators of so foul an act.—*N. Y. Courier and Enquirer.*

ORIGINAL.

FOR THE BANNER OF THE CONSTITUTION.

THE SUGAR DUTY.

Mr. Editor: The letter of Mr. Senator Johnson, to the Secretary of the Treasury, on the subject of the culture of Sugar Cane in Louisiana, dated December 31st, is as pretty a new year's gift as could be offered to the advocates of free trade. He has furnished facts and arguments enough to show the injustice of retaining the present high duty on sugar, and, coming, as they do, from a friend of the American System, whose testimony that party have invoked, I presume they will hardly attempt to discredit their own witness.

Mr. Johnson assures us, that the culture of the cane has increased the value of slaves, and will sustain it so long as sugar maintains its price, in consequence of the great profits resulting from that culture. Here, it is at once avowed, that slaves are not worth so much for cultivating corn, tobacco, rice, and cotton, as for cultivating the cane. And why, then, should the growers of those articles be taxed to keep up the superior profits of the sugar planter? Mr. Johnson dwells, with great fondness, upon this enhanced value of the slave, but will he meet with a responsive feeling among the abolitionists of Pennsylvania? It requires no argument to prove that the chance of freedom to the slave diminishes, in proportion as his value to his master is increased. Besides, the high price, in Louisiana, is a temptation to the slave trader to introduce, into that State, slaves from Africa, and from the adjacent West India islands; a temptation, that the slight risk of detection will hardly check, and, certainly, will not prevent. The average value of slaves in Virginia, is fixed by Mr. Johnson at $200; (a new negro, of course, is worth still less) and, in his appendix, he, by publishing, guarantees the accuracy of a statement, made in the Boston Courier, by which the average value of slaves is fixed at $600. Here, then, is, at least, a bounty of $400 on each slave introduced into Louisiana. Can the cupidity of the slave trader require a greater stimulant? But, although the value of a slave in Virginia is only $200, it would sink in that State to $100, unless the present enormous profits of the sugar planter are sustained. *So says Mr. Johnson.* The people of the United States, are, therefore, to pay a tax on sugar, equal, according to the same authority, to one hundred per cent. on the value of the article, in order to raise the price of slaves from $100 up to $600! Will the people of the United States endure it? Mr. Johnson says the expense of making sugar in Louisiana, is 3 1-2 cents the pound; and as the price is 5 1-2 cents, the profit is 2 cents the pound. Let any farmer or manufacturer compare with his own, this rate of profit, in proportion to the cost of producing, and let him say whether it is not time that the sugar planter should come down to the level of profit with which every other branch of industry in the United States is forced to be content.

If we compare the produce of slave labor on the sugar plantations of Louisiana, with that of slave labor employed in the culture of cotton in South Carolina, or with that of the free laborer of the Eastern States, an additional argument is discovered for reducing the enormous duty on sugar. From Mr. Johnson's pamphlet, it appears that the average produce of 20 plantations, for 5 years, was 4030 pounds of sugar for each laborer; that the quantity of molasses for that quantity of sugar, is 201 1-2 gallons; that the provisions, clothing, and medical attendance, amounts to $61 11 for each slave, and that the price of sugar is 5 1-2 cents the pound, and of molasses 20 cents the gallon. From these data it results, that the gross produce of a laborer on a sugar plantation, is $261 95; from which, deduct the expense of maintaining him, the nett produce of his labor will be $200 84. It is well known that the average gross produce of a slave upon a cotton plantation, does not amount to $120; deducting the same price for his maintenance, and the nett produce of his labor would be $58 89. The free laborers of New England may be hired, on an average, for $120 the year; out of which sum they have to clothe themselves and pay for medical attendance, at an average expense of about $40, which will leave the nett produce of his labor at $80. It must be observed, however, that this is the produce of his labor to himself—not to his employer, for no farmer in New England can afford to carry on a farm with hired labor alone at this rate. On this head, I pledge my own experience, and I appeal to my brother farmers to sustain my position. Thus, the laborer of the sugar planter earns yearly, $141 95 more than the same laborer would earn upon a cotton plantation, and $120 84 more than the free laborer of New England! And yet, we are told that the bounty, which is paid to the Louisiana sugar planter, in our protecting duty, must not be reduced! Separate from all buildings, the land of a sugar estate is estimated, in Mr. Johnson's pamphlet, to be worth $50 the acre; while the average price of farms in New England, including the buildings, would not exceed $20 the acre. And yet we are told to beware how we attempt to bring property somewhat nearer to an equality, by reducing, in some degree, the profits of the sugar planter!

It is in vain, Mr. Editor, that an attempt is made, by exhibiting these facts, to produce an effect upon a certain party in Congress. When pressed to tell why, in the face of facts, such as now have been produced, the heavy duty on sugar should be continued, when not required for the purpose of revenue, they turn from you with the unvarying answer, "it is a part of the American System!" It is, indeed, a part of the American System! A system, borrowed from the despotism and ignorance of past ages in Europe: a system, which is intended to favor particular classes, at the expense of the community at large; a system, which will make the rich, richer, and the poor, poorer; and thus, by increasing the inequality of conditions, bring the people into the right condition for having a yoke put upon their necks, and a bit into their mouths.

A New England Farmer and Representative.

Washington City, 18th Jan., 1831.

FOR THE BANNER OF THE CONSTITUTION.

SINKING OF CAPITAL.

The following is extracted from a Baltimore paper:

"*Crook's Cotton Duck Factory.*—This valuable Factory was sold at auction on Thursday, at Baltimore, and, we understand, was purchased, by Mr. Alexander Mitchell, of this city, for 31,500 dollars."

The above is one of those notices of the termination of a manufacturing speculation, which we see almost every week in some of the newspapers of the Eastern and Middle States.

It was not long since, that the sale of the Saco Cotton Mills was announced, after having, like the Dover Factory, and many others in New England, sunk all, or nearly all, its capital.

This is one of the mischiefs of the anti-commercial or taxing system, which is overlooked even by many of its intelligent opponents., I mean the immense destruction of capital among even those manufacturers whose fabrics receive the highest bounty from the taxes imposed on the people for their benefit. For instance, the manufacturers of coarse woollens used by the poorer classes of people, and which pay 70 to 200 per cent. duties—of glass, who receive, on the sizes and qualities most used by the poor farmer and mechanic, 75 to 100 per cent. duty—of cottons, who get a bounty of 50 to 100 per cent. on coarse articles—of iron, who get a bounty of $22 50 to $37 per ton, on what costs $26 to $52 per ton, &c. We say the manufacturers of these and many other articles taxed 50 to 200 per cent., instead of making a profit, have been ruined by their inexperience, their want of skill, or economy, or from some other cause, of which the public are ignorant. Indeed, such are the embarrassments still in the way of successful manufacturing, that there are few woollen establishments in New England that are worth more than 75 cents per 100 of their actual cost; and even of the cotton establishments, those in the highest repute in this vicinity cannot be sold without a great loss on the original cost. If we go back to 1816, when manufacturing was first forced upon the nation by high duties, many of which have been since doubled, we might probably find, on inquiry, that at least two-thirds of all the undertakers in New England have been ruined, and a much larger portion in the Middle States, where, indeed, they are not likely to succeed for fifty years to come, in competition with the superior skill, larger capitals, lower prices of labor, and greater experience of the New Englanders.

Thus the nation is not only taxed from 50 to 200 per cent. on some of the prime necessaries of life, in order to promote the pecuniary schemes of certain favored classes, but all this is done, in many instances, without saving from ruin the men in whose favor these monopolies are granted.

In the case before us, of domestic duck, in order that a few cotton and linen factories in N. Jersey and Maryland might force into existence a branch of business which we are not prepared for, Congress have imposed a most enormous burden upon the laboring classes, who use the linen fabrics of Russia, Germany, and Scotland, as an article of clothing. And what is the result? Why, as in the case before us, those who have been engaged in the manufacture of cotton or linen duck, have either been ruined or are in danger of it from the many difficulties they have yet to overcome before they can undersell the foreign fabrics high as the consumers are taxed for the benefit of these favored monopolists.

The duty on sail cloth and Ravens duck, under the administration of Washington, who considered commerce as one of the main sources of a nation's prosperity, was five per cent.—This was the rate fixed by Hamilton, who has so often been cited, *though most unwarrantably*, as an authority in favor of the anti-commercial or exclusive system. It was subsequently raised, at various times, but for revenue only. By the act of 1816, the rates were made specific, but were complained of by the navigating interests as too high, and were by the act of 1824 lowered to fifteen per cent. and no one complained of this reasonable duty. In 1828, when certain manufacturing interests who had become aware of their power over the government, through the manufacturing Members of Congress, and their partisans, the duty on all kinds of duck was raised to the enormous rate it now stands at—and for what? Why, that some fifty, sixty, or one hundred proprietors of factories, might compel the merchants, mechanics, and farmers, to consume the home-made article by levying an enormous tax on the fabrics of a much superior quality.

The present duty is ten cents a yard, and to be increased shortly to twelve and a half cents a yard. The Ravens duck may cost in Russia four dollars per piece, on the average, and the duty on it, at twelve and a half cents is $3 75 per piece, or 95 to 100 per cent. This fabric is not only used on our ships, but as an article of clothing for a numerous class of laboring people. On sail cloth used principally for ships, the duty, at twelve and a half cents per yard, amounts from 30 up to 60 per cent., and bears very hard upon our navigating interests, which, as the Secretary of the Treasury intimates in his late Report, is so much depressed as to require relief. The tax paid by a ship owner on the duck used in the sails of a ship of 400 tons, is under the present duty of 10 cents per yard from 340 to $350, and will be increased to upwards of $400* when the duty reaches its maximum. Still, with all the aid of this burdensome, unjust, and unconstitutional taxation, the manufacturers of duck are ruined by their monopoly, and thus sink their own capitals, as well as lessen that of the farmers, mechanics, and merchants, who are taxed for their benefit.

Boston. MERCATOR.

*This is the tax levied on the sails of a ship when built, and is renewed every two or three years, as the sails must be replaced by new ones. The tax on iron and hemp used in building a ship, is still higher.

FOR THE BANNER OF THE CONSTITUTION.

TARIFF USURPATION.

Legislation cannot aid the accumulation of wealth, otherwise than by repealing laws which affect industry. Any law which forces the people to exchange the products of their labor for less than would otherwise be obtained, causes loss to the extent of the difference. Any law which affects industry, causes loss. The argument for commercial restriction, being destitute of reason, rests solely on authority.

I do not believe that there was any insidious design in the tariff party, to seduce Congress into equivocal legislation, whereby its authority should be subsequently cited to support what is now termed the American System—to wit: favoring domestic manufactures, by imposing duties on foreign goods for that purpose. I could, however, frame a tolerably plausible argument, to prove the existence of such a plot. Whether such a suspicion be or be not well founded, it cannot be amiss to show the rise of this usurpation, and its gradual progress. I will show its commencement, in hopes that others will trace its progress.

The first law imposing duties, under the Constitution, was passed July 4, 1789. It is thus entitled: "An act for laying a duty on goods, wares, and merchandises, imported into the U. States." The preamble runs thus:

"Whereas, it is necessary, for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the protection and encouragement of Manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandises, imported into the United States, Be it enacted," &c.

The next act passed for the same purpose, was on the 10th of August, 1790, and is entitled thus: "*An act to make further provision for the payment of the debt of the United States.*" The preamble runs thus:

"Whereas, by an act, entitled "An act for laying duties on goods, wares, and merchandises, imported into the United States," divers duties were laid on goods, wares, and merchandises, so imported, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the protection and encouragement of Manufactures; *And, whereas, the support of the Government, and the discharge of said debts, render it necessary to increase said duties*, Be it enacted," &c.

So far as negation can appear, it does appear, by these two acts, the first that were passed, upon this subject, after the adoption of the Constitution, that Congress did not then claim the authority to impose duties for the *substantive* purpose of encouraging or protecting Manufactures.

The payment of the Public Debt, and the support of the Government, were manifestly the objects for which the acts were passed. The duties imposed by the first act, which only contained a suggestion that Congress had any reference to the incidental benefit of manufactures, were so small—only five per centum ad valorem upon imported goods, without discrimination—that it is obvious that the duties were necessary for the sole purpose of obtaining revenue. The draftsman probably entertained the opinion—afterwards so current—that domestic industry would be favored by duties on imports, and inserted the words "encouragement and protection of manufactures," to render the bill more palateable to the House—or, perhaps, more popular with his constituents. These words are mere surplussage, nowise effecting the enactment of the bill. There was no motive for moving to strike out the irrelevant words, it not being apprehended that any sinister use would afterwards be made of them—and the preamble probably passed *sub silentio*.

The money intended to be raised by the bill was strictly necessary to pay the public debts, and to defray the expenses of the Government. There is nothing in the act to show, that, but for these objects, the duties would have been imposed. They were not higher than was necessary for these objects.

The authority of this act, if any, was overthrown by the succeeding act. The act of July, 1789, was merged in, and virtually repealed by, the act of August, 1790. The last act was passed with the professed intent to increase the duties provided for in the preceding act.

In this act of August, 1790, it appears, by the preamble above recited, that the objects which Congress chose to state for increasing the duties, were, simply and solely, the constitutional objects of supporting the Government, and discharging the national debt. The omission to state the encouragement of manufactures, as one of the objects of the law, is the more remarkable, as the attention of Congress was especially called to that subject by the language of the act, the preamble of the prior act having been incorporated into the act of August 10, 1790.

The phraseology of this act, (Aug. 10, 1790,) and its enactments, both prove that it was passed for constitutional purposes, and therein unlike the act of May 19, 1828, which is now the chief subject of complaint. Extravagant duties, to raise the price of home produce and manufactures, were not thought of. The following selections, may, perhaps, serve to show, that Congress then considered it proper to tax for revenue, and only for revenue. By this act, the duty on molasses is three cents per gallon; on brown sugar, one and a half cents per pound; on velvets, satins, wrought silks, muslins, millinets, lawns, laces, gauzes, chintzes, colored calicoe, and nankins, seven and a half per cent., ad valorem.

The mere authority of Congress, upon a question of constitutional law, would not be regarded in a court of justice, and should not be regarded by any who have access to the Constitution. It is, however, well to know how this error crept in; in what way, and when that honorable body came to be inspired with the vain imagination, that it was entrusted by the Constitution to legislate upon the occupations of the people; or in what way they should dispose of any part of their money, which the Government had not a right to take from them, for the essential objects for which the States acceded to the Union.

MASSACHUSETTS.

FOR THE BANNER OF THE CONTSITUTION.

South Carolina seems to be the nucleus of the opposition to the impolitic, unjust, and unconstitutional system of concealed taxation; not for the general welfare, but for partial, local, and very selfish objects. In this honorable contest against opression—against the coarse domination of the North, I sympathize, perhaps, as much as any other man. The Constitution does not warrant this taxation, and policy, honor, and honesty forbid it. I desire, however, that the party which is right in its principles and objects, should be altogether in the right.

I regret to perceive in the speech of his Excellency Governor Hamilton, what I deem an error. In the honorable zeal which he manifests in a good cause, he has, I think, been led to mistake the remedy. He seems to suppose that South Carolina has a right to declare the act of Congress, of the 19th of May, 1828, null and void, and to hold it so until ratified and confirmed by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States of the Union.

This seems to be an erroneous mode of considering the subject. A State cannot annul an act of Congress, or suspend its operation. The declaration of a State to that effect, would be a mere nullity. It is nevertheless true, that an act of Congress not passed in conformity with the Constitution, is void—in effect, no law. The difficulty in the case is, that the defect of authority does not appear upon the face of the law. Good and bad considerations are mingled together, and the courts could not admit evidence to invalidate the act, by showing that it was passed partly for constitutional purposes, and partly for unconstitutional purposes.

The greater part of the tariff complained of, is enacted by the law of 19th May, 1828. This act provides for nearly the entire revenue of the United States. Of course it was intended to provide for the legitimate purposes of paying the national debt—supporting the army and navy, and providing for the expenses of the government, as well as for the unlawful purpose of favoring one class of citizens at the expense of the rest. The illegal intent does not appear by the law. The enacting clause is simply this:—"From and after the first of September, 1828, in lieu of the duties now imposed by law on the importation of the articles hereinafter mentioned, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, the following duties:"

In this appears no illegality. But courts could not receive evidence as in case of a bond, to show that it was void in part, and therefore void in whole. Parole evidence to that effect, could not be admitted. If it be supposed to be admitted by consent, the testimony of the Members of Congress would make a strange medley of evidence. Many of them,—probably most of them, could not distinctly state upon what grounds, or for what objects they voted for the passage of the aforesaid act, of May 19, 1828. "Non mi ricordo," would be the usual answer.

The Collectors must consider the act lawful. It is the principal authority under which they act. The importers cannot receive their goods until they have given the bonds required. If the bonds are not regularly paid, they are put in suit. It must be evident to any lawyer, that in debt, on bond, under the ordinary plea, *non est factum*, the question for the jury, except in a few special cases, is merely whether the bond was duly executed and delivered. Upon the general issue of *non est factum* upon a revenue bond, the jury, if the execution and delivery of the bond were duly proved, must find the issue for the government. I cannot conceive that, in this case, a special plea could be devised, that would enable the defendant to defeat the suit. If the issue be, as it usually is, upon the execution of the bond, the juries of South Carolina must find according to the evidence. A special plea admitting the bond, and alleging the unconstitutionality of the act of Congress, would probably be met with a demurrer.

The result would be an issue in law, of course to be tried by the court. The astuteness of lawyers may do much, yet I cannot conceive in what way they can, in suits upon revenue bonds, get before the jury the constitutional objection to the bonds, so as to avail themselves of it in the verdict.

In every view of the case, it seems that his Excellency Governor Hamilton, has mistaken the appropriate remedy for the wrongs of which South Carolina justly complains. As the case stands, neither the merchants, nor the consumers in South Carolina, can obtain from the verdicts of juries the redress to which they are entitled by the Constitution.

There should be more magnanimity, more honor, and more honesty in the dominant party in Congress, than to suffer such an error to remain after it has been pointed out. The injustice of a concealed perversion of the Constitution, if not as flagrant, is as odious as an open and avowed disregard of the constitution.

JURIS-CONSULTUS.

FOR THE BANNER OF THE CONSTITUTION.

The English Corn Laws are, perhaps, the most prominent instance of the folly of nations, in the restrictive policy, which is supported with so much authority and with so little reason. These laws, and all similar laws, are opposed to the laws of nature. The earth was, by the Creator, intended for the benefit of man. The benevolent design of the Creator cannot be fulfilled, but by breaking down the division-walls which now prevent the productions of the earth, and the results of human labor, from being interchanged. The family of man should be as one family.

In the present state of the arts—including therein the cultivation of the earth—the great apparent causes of want are, wars and international restriction. Suppose a free untaxed interchange of American provisions and British manufactures—America participates in the benefit of British capital, skill, and long-disciplined industry—Great Britain participates in the benefit of the cheap lands and fertile soil of our country.

The present folly of nations deprives mankind of the benefit of the various soils and climates of the earth, and of the various habits, training, and other peculiar advantages, whereby, not unfrequently, one man effects more—produces more exchangeable wealth, in one day, than can be produced by ten men, in the same time, under other circumstances.

The taking off our restrictions—if liberal policy and good sense should prove as contagious as their opposites have been—would cause the repeal of the British Corn Laws.

What would be the joy and gratitude of the farmers in this country, and the manufacturers in Great Britain, when plenty and comfort should be attained by the simple act of breaking down barriers between the two countries! And what the surprise of politicians, now so self-complacent in their restrictive policy, when it should be demonstrated that want was artificial—of their own contrivance—that it had, in fact, been *enacted* by the American Congress and the British Parliament!

Massachusetts. LIBERALIS.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Boston, 30th December, 1830.

Sir: It is particularly consoling to one of the oldest friends of free trade, of this city, to find so powerful an auxiliary as the Banner of the Constitution approaching our solitary camp. We have endured a long siege, by a well-appointed enemy, whose lines of circumvallation have been extending farther and farther, till, despairing of succour from other States, we attempted lately a *coup de main*, which has given us some little confidence in our own strength. You have probably heard of the *sortie* we made in November. Our success at that time has gained us many friends, as success always will. We are now repairing damages, making movements of *strategie*—[not stratagem, we despise that small game]—and, instead of countermining the underminings of the enemy, we shall soon be able to take high ground beyond their works.

But, to leave the figure—allow me to compliment you on the very judicious choice you have made for the scene of your future labors, and, at the same time, to felicitate the city of New York on becoming the Standard Bearer of the Constitution. The most populous Capital of the most powerful State of the Union, would seem to be entitled to that distinction. The geographical situation of this great State, her wealth, population, and enterprize, are calculated to give her great influence in this Confederacy. And I can imagine no means so effectual, to silence the jealousy of other States, (if it should occur,) as to adopt frankly, and pursue firmly, that honest and national policy, which shall be free from local interest and party politics. When good citizens, from any and every part of the Union, see that a great and powerful State has adopted, as its political creed, *Honesty, and the greatest good of the greatest*

number, all feeling of jealousy must cease. A citizen, coming from a source so pure, for the highest office in the gift of the people, could excite no distrust: for, under such circumstances, the known character, the wise and just policy of the State, would be the best recommendation, and the surest guarantee, which the nation could have, for a wise and equal administration.

The citizens at large can gain nothing by political manœuvres: an advantage gained to-day, by surprise, for one part of the Union, is lost to-morrow, by a necessary re-action. Thus a political and profitless oscillation is kept up, to the disadvantage of all but the great political gamblers, whose stakes *may be* the bread, perhaps the liberties of the people, or the integrity of the Union. The majority of the people have no interest but in wise laws, to protect their persons and the fruits of their labor. They aspire not to place, or pension, and can every where, under equal and just laws, acquire a competency, and independence, which are far preferable to the precarious and fleeting honors and profits which proceed from capricious public favor.

The enlightened and practical inhabitants of the city you have adopted, have great advantages for the investigation of the errors of the Restrictive System, which you have so ably combatted; they have their own practice, and the theory of their neighbors; they have the practice and theory of the various countries with which they trade; they have, finally, many intelligent adopted citizens, whose experience, in countries where *protection* and *regulation* are the cabalistic terms of that great laboratory of political alchymy whereby royal financiers make gold out of the people's bread—they have their dear-bought and valuable experience at hand, for consultation. No one, who has not lived in old countries, can properly appreciate the withering effects of the protective policy, as it is improperly called, if it be intended to apply it to the people.

There seems to have been a faint notion of the advantage of being free from governmental protection, even in countries from whence we should not think of taking lessons in Politics. I remember to have heard, in a French play, an actor exclaim, "Protection! God preserve us from the like!—the greatest favor great folks can confer on us, is, to forget that we exist."

I hope you will continue your very important labors, and find, among the patriotic and aspiring youth of the great city, some generous spirits, who will rise above the miserable trammels of fashion, and lay the foundation of future greatness, on principle, truth, and the real good of their country.

I will conclude this long letter, to a person known to me only as the advocate of true policy, by quoting a passage from a letter, received to-day, from a valued friend in Berkshire county, whose frankness, zeal in the cause, honest policy, and liberal and enlightened mind, have made for him, in our State, a lasting reputation. This friend, speaking of your paper, the Banner, and its great object, the Tariff System, says: "As to the great tariff systems of this country and the world, they *must fall*, as they are a part, and a very great part, of the system of *human degradation!*"

I remain, sir, with high esteem, &c.

PROVIDENCE, January 19th, 1831.

In the last number of the North American Review I have noticed an article on the American System, purporting to be a reply to Mr. Cambreleng's Report, and reviewing Mr. McDuffie's Speech. You have no doubt noticed it. It is desirable that such *stuff*, when it appears in a work like that, should be answered; and it would be well if Mr. Cambreleng himself could deem it proper for him to give it his attention.

I have noticed, with some pleasure, that Mr. Haynes has succeeded in bringing the consideration of the sugar duty before Congress; and I trust that the good sense of the House will be sufficient to place that duty at what it should be. What is your private opinion—is the cause of Free Trade progressing or not? I think it is. Do you think the cause will have greater strength in the next Congress, than in the present? I sincerely believe that New England is undergoing a favorable change on this question.

I recollect you had occasion to publish something on the subject of exporting cotton goods to India; and, having noticed the evidence of Mr. Bates, (of the house of Baring, Brothers, & Co.) before a Committee of the House of Lords, on the India trade, I have extracted the following reply, as being of service, as throwing light on the subject:

"Are you aware whether the Americans import into China any manufactures bearing the same name as the manufactures of England, but not actually manufactured in this country? I believe very considerable—that is, considerable for the United States; shipments have been made, to Manilla and Canton, of a species of cotton, more resembling the white cottons of Bengal, than any cotton goods manufactured here; they are stout goods; they have sold, I understand, very well; *those goods have been imitated, here, at about two-thirds of the American cost, and the business from America, I believe, is at an end.*"

ABBEVILLE C. H. (S.C.) January 11th, 1831.

You have my most hearty wishes for your prosperity. We are in high spirits in this State, and hope to accomplish our end in a short time. We feel highly obliged to you for your services. You have done much, and we hope you will do much more, for the success of Free Trade.

NEWBERN, (N. C.) January 8th, 1831.

The Banner of the Constitution is becoming more popular in this State, and the principles it advocates are more than ever popular with us.

NORTHAMPTON Co. (N. C.) January 20th, 1831.

The Banner has been sent to me for some time. I took it when I thought a mite could do some good. Enclosed you have my subscription, and also the subscription of a friend. Had I time, I could tell you how much good you have done, and may do. I live in a section of country affected by the "*Nagg's-Head*" fever. Many staunch "war-men" have been converted to "peace-men," by the contiguity of their lands to the waters of Albemarle. They ought to be aroused. May your *cause* prosper, and may you do well. *Measures* first, and then *Men*.

[We understand our correspondent to mean, that, for the sake of procuring an appropriation towards improving the navigation of Albemarle Sound, near Nagg's-Head, some opponents of the American System have abandoned their hostility to it. We may perhaps be wrong.—*Ed.*]

SPARTA, (GEO.) January 12th, 1831.

The Banner, with the majority of newspaper-readers, is less interesting than those sheets which contain the common farrago of advertisements, the altercations of political parties, extracts from curious and sometimes very silly books, &c.; but, by another, and far more important class of our community, I can assure you, it is held in the highest estimation. The very best informed of them are abundantly satisfied that the Editor, who vindicates their political doctrines, is contributing weekly to their own edification.

GOOCHLAND Co. (VA.) January 21st, 1831.

I have accidentally met with your valuable paper, in which I have found so many plain truths, unmasked, and so differently guised from any of the hypocrisy of the times, that I have determined, without further delay, to take it. All that I regret is, that I have lost so much of so valuable a paper. If you will send me a Prospectus, I am in hopes I shall get some subscribers.

WASHINGTON CITY, January 26th, 1831.

Yesterday I received a letter from a very intelligent gentleman in Cooperstown, New York, to whom I had sent some of the numbers of your paper. I can assure you he is not alone in his views on the subject in that section. He says—"You have done me a great kindness, by sending the Banner of the Constitution. I have received three numbers, which I have circulated, that others may receive as much information as I have from its perusal. The Northern people have been, and still are, "tickled" by the sound of "Independence," "Independence of English Manufactures," "Protective System," "Encouragement to Domestic Manufactures," "American System," &c.—very much like the Frenchman, who, having lost many wives, became suspected, and it was found out that he *tickled them to death*."

WASHINGTON CITY, January 25th, 1831.

If you will send me a new Prospectus, I will forward it to a friend, who will get you more subscribers. Your paper, I think, has evidently improved since your location in New York, and I am truly glad you have met with an increased patronage. Pray tell me if you are now on a good footing—how many subscribers have you? Wherever your paper circulates, the effect is always felt. At last, however, I look for relief from Congress as perfectly hopeless, unless in deference to an expected action on the part of the Southern States. The people in the entire South are becoming more and more prepared for such an event. There is a variety of opinion and feeling in the planting States, in relation to the oppressions of the General Government, never known before. If the next session of Congress shall afford no grounds for expecting a speedy change of policy, on the part of Congress, the spirit of resistance will scarcely be confined to South Carolina.

[This letter is not from a South Carolinian.]

NEW YORK:

WEDNESDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 2, 1831.

IMPORTANT FOREIGN NEWS.

By the ship Sovereign, which arrived at this port on the 30th ultimo, from London, with dates to the 19th of December, the important intelligence has been received of a Revolution at Warsaw, in Poland, which took place on the 29th of November, and was terminated in a week, by the flight of the Arch-Duke Constantine, towards Russia. The following extracts are from London papers:

On Monday, the 29th November, about 7 o'clock in the evening, an insurrection broke out at Warsaw. It began, it appears, in the military school of ensigns. The young men, to the number of from 500 to 600, took up arms, and, spreading themselves through the town, called the citizens to arms. A multitude of students and inhabitants soon joined them. They proceeded to the barracks of the infantry and the arsenal, which was taken by ten o'clock. The immense quantity of muskets and sabres it contained were distributed to the people. The insurrection had previously gained the barracks of the infantry. The engineer regiment was the first that rose, and several other regiments soon followed it. The Grand Duke Constantine, on the point of being attacked or surrounded in his palace, effected his retreat upon Praga, with his guard, two Russian regiments, and a regiment of Polish cavalry, who only followed him from a sense of military honor, but who will remain neutral, if the soldiers do not disband themselves, or join their fellow citizens in a body. The exasperation, for a long time smothered, was so very considerable at the moment of the insurrection, that some Polish detachments, who, at the commencement, refused to give up their post of arms to the people, were massacred as traitors. Forty one Colonels or Majors were killed in endeavoring to keep the troops in obedience. It is added that two Aids-de-Camp of the Grand Duke were also slain. The opinion at Warsaw was, that the defection of the Polish Army would become general. The Chief of the Municipal Police and two Russian Generals were killed. The German General Hauch and Count Stanislaus Potosky were also killed, in seeking to rally the troops. The military chest and the house of the Paymaster General were plundered. General Klopiecki has taken the command of the Polish troops, and is endeavoring to restore order. It is said that he has already 16,000 troops of the line under his command. The French tri-colored cockade was adopted at the beginning of the insurrection, but it was soon replaced by the Polish cockade. A corps of National Guards is organizing. The Council of Administration established by the Emperor of Russia, in conjunction with Prince Lubeski, Minister of Finances, Prince Adam Czartorinski, and Prince Michael Radvizil, form the Provisional Government, and have issued a proclamation, in which they acknowledge the rights and sovereignty of the Emperor Nicholas, but on condition that the separation of the two States shall be complete, and that no Russian military corps shall keep garrison in the kingdom of Poland. Lieutenant General Prince Adam Czartorinski was the first Minister of Poland, in 1814, when the Emperor Alexander gave to that country a liberal Constitution, the execution of which was afterwards suspended by the same sovereign. Prince Michael Radvizil, also Lieut. General, is a cousin of Prince Anthony Radvizil, who is at present Gov. General of the Grand Dutchy of Posen (Prussian Poland,) and, moreover, brother-in-law to the King of Prussia."

Another account, which corroborates most of the facts above stated, gives the following additional details: "Poland has at length taken up again its standard, which was broken and branded, like that of France, in 1815. For some time past, the report that the Polish army was to march into Russia, whilst a Russian army would come to keep Poland in awe, occupied the public mind, already agitated by the news from France. It was openly said that the army would not suffer this insult, and every thing being prepared for a revolt, an opportunity alone was waited for. This presented itself by chance. The threat of flogging two Polish sub-officers of the Military School, induced these young patriots to rise. The Grand Duke Constantine, whose palace is without the town, mounted his horse at the first news of the insurrection, and advanced with three regiments of cavalry of the Russian Guards;—but he soon found that it was impossible to resist the popular torrent. At daybreak he withdrew, and was joined by the Chasseurs of the Polish Horse Guards, who had experienced some loss in the town. The first act of the Government was to entrust the command of the troops to General Klopiecki, who, being under the surveillance of the Russian police, was not allowed to leave Warsaw for some years past. The Provisional Government has decreed the levy, en masse, of 200,000 men, and the formation of Burgher Guards."

The reception of this intelligence in France excited some impression that a general war was no improbable event.

Some commotions were said to have taken place in the capital of Prussia, and a conspiracy had been detected at Naples.

At Paris, some apprehension prevailed of a popular disturbance, in case the Ex-Ministers should be visited with any punishment short of death; and, in consequence of it, the troops of the line, as well as the National Guard, were placed under the command of Lafayette, in order to be ready at a moment's warning, to repress any riotous movements. The trial of the Ex-Ministers commenced on the 15th December. We subjoin a few extracts from French papers:

PARIS, December 8.—The speech delivered by Baron Richemont, day before yesterday, and which was a kind of hostile manifesto against England, does not obtain any approval amongst the enlightened portion of the community. The most prominent organs of the press, particularly the Constitutionnel, which was always remarkable for its bitterness upon any thing relative to England, disavows the doctrine of M. Richemont, and proves that not only sound reason, but good policy, ought to unite both people in the strictest bonds of amity.

A peaceful, but strongly developed revolution has commenced in Switzerland. Lucerne, Fribourg, and Soleure, have adopted the resolution taken by Zurich, Argova, and Appenzel, and declare that the period has arrived for effecting changes in their Constitution. Their Government, yielding to these representations, tranquillity has not been disturbed.

The last accounts from Algiers bring the news of the defeat and submission of the Bey of Tittery; thus the Algerine territory is coming by degrees under the dominion of France. How the change of time makes people view things in a different light. The occupation would have given rise to a war during the empire, but at the present day, the north of Africa is conquered without any opposition.

The appointment of the Duc de Trevise, (Marechal Mortier) to the situation of Ambassador of France to the Court of Russia, has elated all the politicians, who hail it as a proof that peace will not be disturbed; and in this view of the subject, they are, perhaps, justified.

It was reported yesterday evening, that the Ex-King, Charles X., has protested against the trial of the Ex-Ministers by the Chamber of Peers, but on what ground, or on what terms, is uncertain. It is unnecessary to say, that his Majesty's interference would have no beneficial effect for the accused. The protest is said to have been brought to Paris by an attache of the Ex-Court, and formally presented to the Grande Referendaire of the Chamber of Peers. On Monday next, the prisoners are to be transferred from Vincennes to the Petit Luxembourg.

The trade of Paris is at this moment in a most miserable condition, if compared with former similar seasons. The shops display, it is true, toys, trinkets, ornaments, dresses, and *bon-bons*, as in all former months of December, but there are no customers. In the commercial and manufacturing towns distress prevails to a melancholy extent. The seaport towns are in a ruinous situation, and the state of agriculture is deplorable. There is, nevertheless, no complaint. All rejoice in their lately recovered liberty, and live in hope of better times.

If Congress has the power to enact that a piece of coin, weighing 254 38-53 grains of standard gold, shall be *a legal tender* for ten dollars, has it not the power to enact that 250 grains, or any less number, shall also be a legal tender for ten dollars? If the power to declare what shall be a legal tender exists at all, in Congress, it exists without limitation. And, if it possesses such power without limitation, has it not a right to declare that 15 dwt. of standard silver, or any less quantity, shall be a legal tender for one dollar?

Since the appearance of the article on this subject, in our last paper, we have conversed with a highly respectable gentleman of this city, whose acquaintance with the principles of political economy places him in the first rank of scientific men, on that subject. He informed us, that, in the year 1821, when the proposition for reducing the weight of the eagle was first agitated in Congress, he became alarmed at the consequences which might flow from such an ill-advised step, and, having extensive transactions in bonds, mortgages, ground rents, &c., he adopted the rule, *to which he has ever since adhered*, of introducing into all his contracts a stipulation that the debt was to be paid, in gold or silver money of the United States, *of the standard existing at the time of the contract*. We should recommend all others, who are similarly circumstanced, to pursue the same course. If Congress should pass the law now before it, for reducing the weight of the eagle, another Congress will pass a law reducing the weight of the dollar, and our posterity may see the day when a debt contracted for a thousand ounces of silver will be discharged with five hundred ounces, or less, of silver, as we ourselves are likely to see 254 grains and a fraction of gold discharge a debt contracted for 270 grains.

In a part of the impression of our last paper, a mistake occurred, by transposing the second and third pages, which was not discovered until it was too late to rectify it.

We are not able to publish to-day the promised essay on the Relative Value of Gold and Silver. Our copy was loaned to a friend at a distance, in the hope of our being able to get one from another source—but in this we were disappointed. It will appear in our next.

The receipts of Tolls on the Erie and Champlain Canals, during the past year, amounted to 1,029,932 dolls., exceeding, by a quarter of a million of dollars, the receipts of any previous year.

In order that our readers may see that an interest is felt in reference to the principles of Free Trade, in the remotest regions of the West, we have copied from the Advocate, published at Little Rock, in the Territory of Arkansas, the following article :

The "Banner of the Constitution."—We are gratified to learn that this valuable paper is not to be discontinued at the end of its present volume, as was anticipated by the enemies of "free trade." This able advocate of the true doctrines of the Constitution, is to be removed from Washington City, the seat of its present location, to New York, where the first number of its second annual volume will be issued, in the first week of December.

In order that our readers may have documentary evidence of the cost of Sugar in the West Indies, we copy, from the New York Standard, the following extract of a letter, dated

"HAVANNA, December 15th, 1830.

"Since our last advice, there has been but little business doing in our market.

"Molasses, hhd. $15, and very little in market.

"Sugar, assorted, half white and half brown, 7r. a 11r. per arr.—white alone, 10r. a 13r.—brown alone, 3r. a 5r.—yellow, 6r. a 7r.—Muscovado, none."

Stripped of its mercantile technicalities, this letter shows, that the price of brown Havanna Sugar is at 3 to 5 rials per arroba. The rial is the 8th part of a dollar, and the arroba is 32 lbs. Spanish, which is heavier than English, and equal to at least 33⅓ lbs. of our weight. Taking, then, 4 rials, or half a dollar, as the medium price of 33⅓ lbs., we have $1 50 as the price of 100 pounds.

The "New York Standard and Statesman" is a paper thoroughly devoted to the principles of Free Trade. Its Editor has lately published a letter, addressed to him by a former subscriber to the Statesman, requesting to have the paper discontinued. By way of a *bon bouche* to our subscribers at the South, and of letting them see the extent to which men can cling on to a shadow, long after they have lost the substance, we give an extract from it :

"Should I ever wish to support and advocate foreign politics and measures, I will send to Europe for a prompter, rather than take an amalgamated double and twisted American.

"I admonish you to beware of the *ghost* of the lamented *Mr. Carter*, late Editor of the Statesman. You have traduced the paper he once edited, but his reputation as a consistent politician is above your reach.

"I am, sir, a pupil of the old Jeffersonian school, and reside near the *Green Mountains, Vermont*, and have the privilege of breathing the pure air of democracy, uncontaminated by British influence."

The commission merchants in South America, who reside at the ports at which depreciated currencies circulate, are generally in the practice of communicating, in their letters, besides the prices current of merchandise, the value of the currency, in Spanish dollars, or in bills on London. Indeed, without such a key, the price current would be of no use, and if published, as it often is, might be productive of much mischief, by leading unskilful people astray, especially manufacturers of cotton goods, and fifty other articles that we export to those countries.

By the last letters from Rio de Janeiro, to the 11th November, flour is quoted at 14‖ to 18‖ ; the average of which is 16‖—that is, 16 milreas, the ‖ being the sign of a mil-rei, that is, a thousand reis—as $ is our sign of a dollar. Now, a new hand, unskilled in commerce, as we have often known to be the case, having understood that a milrei is $1 24, which is its value established by our laws, although by our Mint regulations its true value is but $1 11-222, as we see by the late Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, would be very apt to suppose that 16 milreis was within sixteen cents of being $20, and might thus be lured into a shipment, that would possibly occasion a loss. The risk, however, is removed when the key is furnished, which, in the letter referred to, is only done in part, by quoting "the exchange on England at 21½d."—that is to say, a bill for 21½ pence sterling can be purchased with a milrei. Now let us, with this key, unlock the price of flour. If 1 milrei is equal to 21½d., 16 milreis are equal so £1 8s. 8d.—and, if £1 sterling is equal to $4 80, the true par, at this time, of a Spanish dollar, £1 8s. 8d. is equal to $6 88, which is but a trifle more than one-third of $20, the ostensible price. Now, as freight, insurance, duties, commissions, and other charges, are to be deducted from this $6 88, we think that a pretty Flemish account will be rendered to those who sell at 14 milreis.

It is owing to a want of this sort of analysis, that our exporters of cotton goods to Brazil, Buenos, Monte Video, and Chili, deceive themselves with the belief that they make money upon the outward shipment—and, if they lose upon the voyage all round, they are silly enough to ascribe it to the return shipment—insisting upon it that the outward sales are always to a profit. In all those countries the currency is depreciated, and to such various degrees, as to have no two places alike, not even in the same dominion.

But, it may be said, if the true price at which flour is sold be low, the true price at which sugar, coffee, hides, and other articles, are purchased, is correspondingly low. This is true, but it does not alter the state of the case. These last could be purchased as low by a shipment of gold, or silver, or bills, as by the shipment of flour or manufactures, and the simple question for a merchant would be this : "Will the sales of a cargo nett me more effective money, at the spot where I wish to purchase sugar, coffee, or hides, than I should possess, if, instead of shipping a cargo, I were to ship coin, or to transmit bills on London?" The answer would determine the expediency of the shipment, and that merchant or manufacturer must very imperfectly understand his business, who would prefer to place funds abroad for the purpose of buying foreign commodities, in the most expensive of two modes.

We have, upon several occasions, in this journal, endeavored to draw public attention to the impolicy of constructing roads and canals before they are actually called for by the real wants of the community. In doing this, however, we have limited our remarks to the simple operation of such a policy upon the productive power of capital, and not upon the capital itself. In other words, we have shown, that, if a road was constructed several years before it was required, the community would lose a value equal to the revenue that could have been derived from the capital expended in its construction, had it been employed, during those several years, in some pursuit of agriculture, commerce, or manufactures, precisely in the same way that a farmer would lose the profit of five years upon a thousand dollars, if he should be silly enough to expend that sum in building a barn five years before it was wanted.

An enlightened friend in Philadelphia has recently called our attention to another view of the subject, which presents the impolicy of anticipated expenditures in a light so striking, that none can fail to perceive it. It seems now to be pretty generally admitted, if we are to judge from the movements now taking place in England and in this country, that railroads are in a great degree to supercede canals, as canals have superceded turnpike roads. Already have rail roads been projected to run in the neighborhood of canals already formed, and upon routes where there cannot, for years to come, be profitable employment for both. In such cases, it is manifest, that, should the canals be rendered valueless, the capital expended in their construction will have been wholly annihilated; and it is equally clear, that, in some of the cases, this annihilation will have been entirely occasioned by the impolicy of anticipated expenditure. But, to illustrate what we mean, we will take a particular case.

The State of Pennsylvania has, within the last few years, expended near eleven millions of dollars in the construction of canals, scattered over various parts of her territory. Some of these canals were called for, and some were not called for, by the actual circumstances of the country; but, instead of commencing one work and finishing it, and then commencing another work and finishing it, as sound wisdom and economy dictated, she began them all at once, and now finds herself in want of three millions of dollars more, without having had the satisfaction of seeing one of them completed. Now, it is very evident, that, should rail roads answer the expectations of those who have compared their advantages with those of canals, it is quite probable that some of these canals will be wholly superceded by them, and thus will the whole capital have been sunk, altogether owing to the folly of forcing the improvement before the proper time for it had arrived.

In making these remarks, the reader will not understand us to say, that a community should hesitate to act, least some unforeseen improvement should soon follow. A greater loss might occur by such a course, than by the event thus intended to be guarded against. In all enterprises there is some risk on this score, and especially in the present age of invention; but this risk will always enter into the calculations of individuals, and when improvements are left to *their* management, there is not much mischief to be apprehended. It is against the ill-judged, unreflecting, unsound mode of forcing unnecessary improvements, by the scrambling principle, that we inveigh—against that system which argues, that, although a canal between A and B is wanted, and one between C and D will not be wanted for ten years to come, yet we, the representatives of the country lying between C and D, will not vote to expend a million of the public money *advantageously* for you, unless you will agree to expend another million, *disadvantageously*, for our benefit. This is the principle upon which the legislation of Pennsylvania has been conducted, ever since she embarked largely in turnpike roads, and there is not a member of her Senate and House of Representatives, who will not confess, that he has often found himself in the predicament of the inhabitants of the West India island, at which a Yankee captain once arrived with a cargo of cheeses and grind-stones, and finding a scarcity of the former, and no demand for the latter, refused to sell any man a cheese, that would not take a grind-stone along with it. We speak on this subject with some experimental knowledge of the fact, and we greatly mistake if Pennsylvania is not *millions of dollars* the worse off, for this vicious system of log-rolling.

Not long since, a letter was published from a Pennsylvanian, travelling in England, who stated that he had seen the principal canals and rail roads of that country, and that he very much feared, that the expenditures of Pennsylvania on canals, would prove to be an unfortunate appropriation. The following extract, from another letter from a Philadelphian, published in the United States Gazette, seems also to strengthen this apprehension, and if there be any force in what we have said, the argument will apply with equal strength, to future *anticipated expenditures* for rail roads; for what evidence have we, that those of the present day may not be superceded by improvements which will greatly reduce the expense of their construction ?

"Since I have been in Great Britain, I have had an opportunity of seeing and travelling on the 'Merthyr Tydvil,' the 'Peak Forest and Coomford,' the 'Stockton and Darlington,' the 'Monkland,' the 'Liverpool and Manchester,' and other rail-ways, and also of travelling on some of the finest canals in the country, and my opinion of the superiority of the former over the latter species of improvement, is confirmed. I have also conversed with some of the most eminent engineers in the kingdom, such as Mr. Walker, of London, Mr. Hartley, of Liverpool, Mr. Landale, of Dundee, Mr. Grainger, and Mr. Stevenson, of Edinburgh, &c., who unite in opinion, that in nine cases out of ten, rail-ways were superior to canals for general purposes, before the important improvement in locomotives, and since, they are incomparably superior."

In addition to the arguments which have been urged in this and other journal, against the folly and injustice of taxing the people of the United States upwards of *four millions of dollars* a year, for the mere purpose of enabling a few rich planters in Louisiana to derive two hundred dollars per annum for each of the twenty thousand hands who are employed in producing the whole quantity of sugar raised in that State. Nature has herself raised her powerful voice against the monopoly, as will appear from the following article, copied

From the Mobile Register of December 23.

The Weather.—It is seldom that we have occasion to bedow a paragraph upon this topic, but the degree of cold we have experienced for a day or two past, seems sufficiently remarkable to be recorded. The night before last, the mercury in Farenheit's thermometer, having a northern exposure, fell 22 degrees below freezing point, and at 7 o'clock, yesterday morning, it stood 11 degrees above zero. This is within two degrees as cold as it was in February, 1828, when all the orange trees in this city and New Orleans were destroyed.

From the foregoing, it appears that the climate of Alabama and Louisiana, is subject to visitations of cold, from which the sugar growing countries, lying between the tropics, are altogether exempt. The writer of this article, during a residence of near five years at so great a distance as 22 degrees from the equator, never saw Farenheit's thermometer below 58 above zero, and never so low as that but once. The sugar planters of Louisiana, therefore, it seems, not only require legislative protection against foreign industry, but even against *the laws of nature*.

The following article contains a compound of bad feeling, prejudice, and want of acquaintance with the principles of commerce, which is neither creditable to the writer nor to those editors who have copied it into their papers without comment.

British Flag.—In passing down to this office on Wednesday, we noticed the British flag flying at the mast head of a schooner lying in one of the wharves at Halbwell. To see the *British* flag thus proudly waving so far in the inferior of Maine, is somewhat unusual. It may be sociable; but the spectacle caused a Yankee sensation to possess our frame. Whether she came to leave British gold in exchange for Kenebec turkeys, butter, cheese, beef, pork, &c.; or whether she brought molasses from the West Indies, or British goods from the mother country, to exchange for Yankee money, we did not stop to inquire.

Gardiner, (Me.) Chronicle.

One of our exchange papers says :

A writer in the Boston Gazette states that the price of otto of roses, used in scenting snuff, &c., which had gradually fallen from $15 per ounce to a less sum, on account of the extended cultivation, has again risen, in consequence of the horses of the Russian army having early destroyed the rose bushes around Adrianople.

The delightful essence here spoken of, which was once nearly worth its weight in gold, is now to be had at $3 50 per ounce, which is only three times its weight in silver. Now, would it not be a good policy, instead of exporting our specie to Turkey, and throwing it away upon so expensive a foreign luxury, in order to encourage the industry of a parcel of lazy Musselmen, to keep our money at home, and manufacture the otto of roses ourselves? Roses, we all know, grow well in this country, and they are susceptible of an indefinite culture, and it is a favorite maxim with the exclusive friends of domestic industry, not to import any thing that we can raise ourselves. Now, we understand that it only takes about a hogshead full of rose leaves to make a drop of the otto, and one can easily perceive the immense quantity of American industry it would require to make an ounce. But it is practicable, provided only that the duty should be a little increased. The duty is now 30 per cent. ad valorem. We would recommend it to be changed into *a specific duty* of ten dollars per ounce, and it could not fail to be a profitable branch of manufacture for those who should undertake it, unless, indeed, the smugglers should step in, and take the business out of the hands of the manufacturers, as they *have already* done in some other articles.

Our State Rights friends will read with satisfaction the following resolution, adopted unanimously, at a Meeting of the Republican Young Men, in the fourth ward of this city, on the 29th December last.

Resolved, That we cordially unite in the views of the General Administration, in promoting the genuine principles of Republicanism, and preserving the Constitution in its original purity, whereby the sovereignty of the individual States is preserved, and a system of extending the powers of the General Government by construction, so dangerous to our liberties, and so destructive to the primary objects of the American Confederacy, is prevented—and that it is our duty to cherish and maintain those principles by all means in our power, and to transmit them unimpaired to posterity.

There are certain editors who profess to advocate the cause of free trade, but who, through carelessness, or want of reflection, admit into their columns, without a single word of comment, articles extracted from other papers, the tendency of which, is to promote the views of the opposite party. This conduct reminds one of the fable of the Stag and the Peasant. When that noble animal sought protection from the pursuit of the huntsman, it was promised by the peasant; but, whilst the latter denied to the pursuers that he had seen the stag pass that way, he pointed with his finger to the spot where the unfortunate victim was concealed. The efforts of the tariff party to

fasten the restrictive system upon the country, are unceasing. Every mean is resorted to which can possibly operate upon the public mind to render it palatable, and to clothe it with the charms which fallacy alone can confer, and it therefore calls for a corresponding vigilance on the part of the friends of free trade, to counteract the efforts which are thus constantly making. It is, indeed, a duty which they owe to the cause of truth and to the country, not to be instrumental, in the slightest degree, in giving countenance to any publication which favors the policy which *they know* to be unsound and injurious to the public interests; but, if to please any portion of their subscribers, they feel themselves bound to administer poison to the community, let the bane be always accompanied by an antidote. There is no danger from error when truth is allowed to travel by its side; and we would not hesitate to publish the strangest conceits which have ever been put forth by the school of the political arithmeticians, if we were allowed, as we happily are in this Journal, to accompany them by the refutations of which we know they are all susceptible.

The present day may very appropriately be called "a time to try men's souls." This country has never been so near a political vortex as at this moment. *If the freedom of industry, in its most full and unlimited extent,* is not now rescued from the hands of those who have, for some years, trampled it under foot, what possibility will there be for its redemption under the CONSOLIDATED GOVERNMENT, which is now erecting with all the speed of which so hideous and gigantic a structure admits, under the *forms* of a limited Constitution? Is not this a question calculated to excite the zeal, and arouse the patriotic spirit of every man in the land, who believes that *the liberty of the hand* is one of the most precious birth-rights of a nation descended from freemen? Can there be a political economist, even amongst those whose literary pursuits exempt them from the turmoil and bustle of the political world, who can stand by and see the vital interests of a whole nation forever sacrificed, to gratify the avarice or the political ambition of those who can only rise to wealth and power upon their country's ruin? Is there any editor, whose mind is imbued with the truths of economical science, and who is, of course, convinced that the prosperity and true liberty of this whole people, depend upon the unimpaired right of pursuing the business or occupation for which their mental and physical powers best qualify them, who is prepared to stand neutral in a contest involving the dearest rights of the present age, and the best hopes of posterity? Unfortunately, we fear there are too many such, and sorry are we to believe it. The day, however, will come, when the timid and lukewarm will in vain endeavor to mitigate the fury of the storm, which they could now avert by their interference. The day will come, when the power of the press, north of the Potomac, which, if wielded now in the cause of truth and justice, of Liberty, the Constitution, and the Union, would be omnipotent, will be as feeble as the idle wind which passes by unheeded. The responsibility, then, resting upon the conductors of the press, *who conscientiously believe in the truth of the free trade doctrines,* is of no ordinary magnitude. They have a high duty to perform, one which is greatly paramount to the duty they owe to any party or sect of politicians, or body of monopolists. They owe a duty to *the country,* and one which they are, at this crisis, solemnly called upon to perform. Can they look at the proceedings of the Legislatures of South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, and to the style and tone of the Messages of the Governors of those States, and of Virginia, and fancy that such a devotion to the cause of liberty, as has been by them proclaimed, is idle vapor? Can they look at the style and temper of the great mass of the papers published south of the Potomac, and read the opinion confidently expressed, even by some of the most moderate politicians, that, upon the abandonment of the restrictive system, will, in a great measure, depend the salvation of the Union, and not see that danger is at hand? It is impossible. Why, then, will they not step forward, and assist in averting the calamity, for calamity it will be, whether the issue be disunion or consolidation? Between those two awful results, we see no middle ground, except in the abandonment of the restrictive system. They are the Scylla and Charybdis between which our ship of state has to steer, and to avoid them both requires nothing but that those who sail in the ship, should have a compass to direct their course. This they cannot have but through the instrumentality of the press. If the press, therefore, do not assist, upon the press lies the weight of the responsibility of a shipwreck.

The numerous fires which have taken place, within the last two years, of factories, cannot fail to have attracted the attention of every reader of a newspaper; nor can it have escaped him, that attempts have been made, by the advocates of the American System, to impress the public mind with the belief that those fires have been the work of incendiaries, hostile to the prosperity of domestic manufactures. Some weak and ignorant people even go so far as to express an opinion that the British Government has employed emissaries to perform the destructive deed; whilst others are content to fix the crime upon the British manufacturers or their agents. Many, also, are charitable enough to suppose that the native friends of free trade rejoice at this destruction of property. These accusations are all too silly to be seriously answered, and we caution our restrictive gentlemen, who now say they can undersell the British in Calcutta, in Turkey, and in South America, to beware how they render themselves liable to a similar imputation, whenever a British factory happens to take fire, or whenever destruction is levelled at labor-saving machinery in Europe. As to the charge of the native friends of free trade rejoicing at the destruction of factories, it is not founded in fact. They know, too well, the injury which a community sustains by every destruction of capital, to rejoice at a calamity; and, from what we shall say hereafter, we think it will be made to appear, that more joy has been excited in other quarters, where it would least be looked for.

That some of these fires have originated from the ordinary accidents, which no caution can guard against, is to be admitted: that others have resulted from spontaneous combustion, is highly probable: but, that many have arisen from carelessness, and *a carelessness grounded in a secret desire to see a losing concern close by a claim upon insurers,* we have reasons for believing there is too much occasion to suspect. We have lately conversed with an intelligent gentleman, who is an active director in a Fire Insurance Company in New England. He informed us, that he had been greatly surprised, upon examining into the details of the mode of managing some factories, the proprietors of which had applied for insurance at his office, to observe the careless and negligent custom existing in some, as to the care of fires—and he said, explicitly, that he had known many risks refused on account of the anxiety displayed to cover large sums, which had excited suspicions that the applicants, if insured, would rather see their property in flames, than not. We have no doubt that other Directors of fire insurance companies could corroborate this statement, and we know that we are not singular in our belief that many a fire might have been prevented, for which the pockets of insurers have had to suffer.

POLITICS FOR FARMERS.

[*Continued from page* 72.]

In our two last papers we gave evidence enough to refute the position that the fall which has taken place in the prices of goods, since the year 1816, has been occasioned by the Protective System, having shown that articles subject to low duties, and no duties at all, have fallen, as well as those subject to high duties. We proceed to-day with the list. The prices of 1816 are of the 2d of April, before the Tariff of that year was passed—those of the present year are of the 5th of January.

Ochre, (yellow, dry,)—Was, in 1816, $3 per cwt.; the duty was then 2 cents per lb.—the price is now $3 25, and the duty 1 cent. Ochre, (ground in oil,) was, in 1816, at $8 per cwt., and the duty 3 cents; it is now $5, and the duty 1½ cents. If the duty has affected the price, the lowering of it, in 1816, to the present rates, has increased the price of the dry ochre, and lowered the price of the other.

Oils.—In 1816 *Olive* Oil was at $1 75 per gallon, and the duty 30 per centum—the duty was in that year changed to 25 cents per gallon, at which it has since remained, and the price is now $1 05. *Linseed* (American) was at $1 04, and is now at 76 cents—the duty, in 1816, was 30 per cent.; it is now 25 cents per gallon. *Whale* was at 90 cents; now it is at 37. *Sperm* Summer was at $1 75; now it is at 73 cents. *Sperm* Winter was at $2; now it is at 90 cents. *Liver* was at $16 per barrel; now it is at $14 50. The duty on all was 30 per cent.; they are now 25 cents per gallon.

Plaister of Paris—In 1816, was at $10 per ton; it is now at $4. It has always been *duty free,* for the benefit of agriculture.

Pork.—In 1816 *Mess* was at $23 per cwt.; now it is at $13 75—*Prime* was at $18 50; now it is at $10—Cargo was at $16; now it is at — [not quoted.] The duty, in 1816, was 25 per ct. ad valorem; it is now 2 cts. per lb., and is a very ruinous duty to the farmers, if high duties make things cheap.

Porter.—In 1816 *London* was at $3 per dozen; it is now $2 50. The duty, in the former year, was 32 cents per dozen; it is now at 40 cents.

Raisins.—In 1816 *Malaga* were at $10 50 per cask—*Muscatel* at $4 per box—and *Bloom* at $2 75. The first named is now at $6 75—the second at $2 12½—and the third at $2. In 1816 the duty was, upon Malaga 3 cents, and upon the others 4 cents, per lb.; it is now the same.

Rags—In 1816, were at $10 per cwt. for foreign, and $6 for country; the former are now $3 to $8, and the latter $3 to $5. This article has always been *duty free,* for the protection of the paper makers.

Rice—In 1816, was at $4 62½ per cwt.; it is now at $2 50. The duty, in the former year, was 25 per centum, and was in that year reduced to 15 per centum, where it has ever since remained.

Salt-Petre.—In 1816 *Refined* was at 40 cents per lb.—and *Crude* at 25 cents. It was then admitted duty free. In that year a duty was imposed of 7½ per cent., which was increased, in 1824, to 12½ per cent. upon crude, and 3 cents per lb. upon refined. The price is now 9½ for refined, and 7½ for crude.

Salt.—In the two years the prices are quoted as follows:

	1816.	1831.
Lisbon, per bushel,	60 cents	42 cents.
Cadiz, per bushel,	50 cents	42 cents.
Liverpool Ground, per bushel,	55 cents	38 cents.

The duty, in 1816, was 20 cents per 56 lbs., and continued so until the 1st of January, 1831, when it was reduced to 15 cents.

Sheeting.—Russia, in 1816, was at $21 for white, and $19 for brown; the present price is $10 50 for the former, and $9 50 for the latter, which is just half price. In 1816 the duty was 25 per cent. *ad valorem,* and still continues at that rate—and, if it were not for the duty, the price would be as much less, than now, as the amount of the duty paid.

Shot.—In 1816 the price of all kinds was $11 50 per cwt., and the duty was 2 cents per lb., but was raised, in 1824, to 3½ cents, and, in 1828, to 4 cents, and is prohibitory. The price is now 5 cents for patent, and 6 cents for buck, per lb. Notwithstanding this great fall, were it not for the duty, Shot would be still cheaper: for we find it quoted, in the "British and Foreign Price Current," published at London, on the 30th November last, as follows:

Shot, Patent, 1 to 5, per ton,	£17
" A.A. A.B., 6 to 12, per ton,	18

Now, taking the average of these two prices, that is £17 10, and the pound sterling at $4 80, we have 3½ cents and a small fraction as the price of a pound of Shot—which, were it not for our duty, enacted for the purpose of putting money into the pockets of less than a dozen rich owners of shot-towers, could be brought to us at a little more than 4 cents per pound, which is 20 to 30 per cent. cheaper than the present prices.

Skins.—In 1816, *Deer,* in hair, was at 30 cents per lb.; it is now at 8—Shaved was at 45 cents; it is now at 14—Mogadore Goat Skins were at 88 cents each; they are now at 25. Skins have always been free of duty, for the benefit of manufacturers.

Soap.—In 1816 Castile was at 22 cents per lb.; it is now 9—American Brown was at 15; it is now at 5½. The duty, in 1816, was 4 cents per lb., and is the same now.

Spanish Brown.—In 1816 *Dry* was at $3 per cwt.; it is now $1 25—*Ground in Oil* was at 7 cents per lb.; it is now 4 1-2. The duty, in 1816, was 2 cents per lb.; it is now 1 cent for dry, and 1½ for ground in oil.

Spelter.—In 1816 it was at 13 cents per lb.; it is now at 2 3-4. For the benefit of manufacturers, it has always been duty free.

Spices.—The following are the quotations of the two years:

	1816.	1831.
Cassia, per pound,	$0 85	$0 17
Cloves, per pound,	1 12	0 45
Ginger, race, per pound,	0 23	0 08
pure ground, per lb.,	0 60	0 09
Nutmegs, per pound,	3 50	1 35
Pepper, per pound,	0 29	0 13½
Pimento, Jamaica, per lb.	0 25	0 15½

The duties upon these articles have all been lowered since 1816.

Spirits.—The following are the quotations of the two years:

	1816.	1831.
Jamaica, 4th proof,	$1 50	$1 00
West India, 3d proof,	1 19	0 80
New England, 1st proof,	0 77	0 35
Brandy, Cognac, 4th proof,	2 00	1 62
Bordeaux, 4th proof,	1 50	1 50
Gin, Holland, 1st proof,	1 25	1 09
Country,	0 75	0 35
Whiskey, Rye,	0 60	0 29
Apple,	1 00	0 30

The duties on Spirits were, in 1816, from 56 to 64 cents per gallon, and are now from 57 to 63 cents.

Steel.—In 1816 *German* was at 13 cents per lb.; it is now at 10½—American was at $6 per cwt.; it is now at 5½ cents per lb. The duty, in 1816, was at $2 per cwt., and is now at $1 50 per cwt.

Sugar.—The following are the quotations of the two years:

	1816.	
Muscovado, prime,	$17 50	per cwt.
2d and 3d qualities,	15 00	per cwt.
New Orleans, prime,	18 00	per cwt.
2d and 3d qualities,	17 25	per cwt.
Havanna, white,	26 00	per cwt.
2d and 3d qualities,	24 00	per cwt.
brown,	19 25	per cwt.
2d and 3d qualities,	18 00	per cwt.
Martinique, clayed white,	22 00	per cwt.
clayed brown,	19 00	per cwt.
Brazil,	23 00	per cwt.
Lump,	34 00	per cwt.
Loaf,	35 00	per cwt.

	1831.	
St. Croix,	8 to 10	cents per pound.
New Orleans,	5 to 7½	cents per pound.
Havanna, white,	9½ to 11½	cents per pound.
brown,	7 to 8	cents per pound.
Muscovado,	6 to 7	cents per pound.
Porto Rico,	7 to 8	cents per pound.
Brazil, white,	7 to 8½	cents per pound.
brown,	5 to 6½	cents per pound.
Lump,	15 to 15½	cents per pound.
Loaf,	17 to 18	cents per pound.

The duties, in 1816, were at 5 cents for brown, 6 for white, 13 for lump, and 18 for loaf; but were reduced, in that year, to 3 cents for brown, 4 for white, 10 for lump, and 12 for loaf, at which they have since remained. Notwithstanding this great reduction of prices, they would be still lower were it not for the existing duties.

[*To be continued in our next.*]

EDITED BY CONDY RAGUET.

TERMS.—This paper is published every *Wednesday,* at the City of New York, and will, as heretofore, advocate the principles of Free Trade and a limited construction of the Constitution.

The price is Five Dollars per annum, payable annually in advance. ☞ Subscriptions, for less than a year, at the rate of Six Dollars per annum.

☞ Communications to be addressed to the Editor, and all postages to be paid, except upon letters enclosing the amount of one year's subscription.

Printed by T. W. USTICK, Ann Street, eight doors from Broadway, (near the Park,) New York.